







PROPERTY OF  
NORTHEASTERN BIBLE INSTITUTE LIBRARY  
MEX FELS, NEW JERSEY





220.1  
M1239

# THE GRAND OLD BOOK

BEING

## LECTURES ON INSPIRATION

AND

## *THE HIGHER CRITICISM*

BY

A. M<sup>c</sup>CAIG, B.A., LL.D.,  
*Principal, Pastors' College, London.*

רֵאשִׁית דְּבָרֶיךָ אֱמֶת

'The sum of Thy word is truth.'

καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή·  
'And the Scripture cannot be broken.'

SECOND EDITION.

PRINTED AT THE BARNES PUBLICATION HOUSE,  
GOSSEL, GERMANY.

PUBLISHED BY THE RUSSIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY  
LONDON AND CHICAGO.  
1923.

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE  
POWELL LIBRARY  
SANTA CLARITA, CA 91321

220.12  
M121



TO  
THE PRECIOUS MEMORY OF  
CHARLES HADDON SPURGEON,  
FOUNDER OF THE PASTORS' COLLEGE,  
THE GREATEST PREACHER OF THE WORD,  
AND ONE OF THE NOBLEST DEFENDERS OF THE FAITH  
THIS AGE HAS SEEN,  
THIS VOLUME IS  
AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED.





## P R E F A C E.

---

**T**HIS volume consists of Lectures given to the Students of the Pastors' College, who expressed a strong desire for their publication, in the belief that they would meet a distinct want of the present day. It remains to be seen whether that judgment will be endorsed by the Christian public; but there can be no doubt that the question of Biblical Inspiration is a burning one. It is vitally connected with all Christian doctrine. It is of the first importance for us to know how we are to regard that Book which we have been accustomed to revere as the WORD OF GOD. If it is not entirely reliable, then manifestly we are without any sure guide through this wayless world. The Lectures uphold the old belief in the Bible as the Divine Word, and advocate the doctrine of its Plenary and Verbal Inspiration, special attention being given to the testimony of Christ and His Apostles.

In treating of this subject, some notice has been taken of the assumptions of the Higher Critics in regard to the Old Testament. It did not lie within the plan of the Lectures to treat of the Higher Criticism as a whole, but merely to view it in the light of the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles; and subsequently when dealing with objections

to note some of the difficulties raised by the new theories. In dealing with this part of the question, I have specially considered the views of the Critics as set forth in the writings of the representatives of the school in this country; Dr. W. Robertson-Smith, Dr. Driver, Dr. Cheyne, and Dr. Horton, for although the last-named has produced no work specifically on the Higher Criticism, yet just as the before-mentioned trio have popularized the critical theories among students, so Dr. Horton has endeavoured to familiarize the 'common people' with the results of these theories.

As to the broader subject of Inspiration, I am quite aware that the position I occupy is not a popular one among the leaders of present-day Christian thought; still its unpopularity has not led me to abandon it, since I have seen no other reason for doing so. The recent discussion in a weekly journal has brought the subject more prominently before the public, and it may be hoped that it will have the effect of leading Christian men to ponder the matter more seriously, and to conclude that logically there is no safe resting-place between the belief in Full Inspiration, and the denial of Inspiration altogether. Years ago when studying the question, the most helpful thought that came to me was the distinction between Revelation and Inspiration; since then I have seen Dr. Lee's noble book, and had my former opinion greatly confirmed by his able treatment of the same distinction. I may here state that to that book I am indebted for some of the illustrations of so-called discrepancies and scribal errors. Other books, besides those indicated in the lectures, which I have found more or less helpful are, not to mention commentaries, 'Light from



Ancient Monuments,' by Professor Sayce; 'The Newer Criticism,' by Dr. R. Watts; 'Hebraica,' vols. v. and vi. Specially for help in dealing with the question of the extermination of the Canaanites, would I record my indebtedness to a book, not so well known as it deserves to be, entitled 'Moses and Christ,' written by one who was my teacher in early days, and whose memory will ever be very fragrant to me, the late Mr. William Glass, of Dunfermline.

Most of the Lectures are given as they were delivered, but as, in the course of delivery, several points were treated orally, I have endeavoured, in some of the Lectures, to incorporate the spoken matter, and so make a nearer approach to completeness of treatment, while a few additional examples of discrepancies have been given. After all, I am conscious that the work is far from being complete, but is sent forth in the hope and with the prayer that the Lord of the Word may use it for His own glory, in leading some to a deeper appreciation of the Word of the Lord—the Grand Old Book.

ARCHIBALD MCCAIG.

*January, 1894.*

---

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

---

THIS volume has long been out of print, being scarcely obtainable even in second-hand-bookshops, and I have been frequently urged to reprint it. I have long hoped to recast and revise it before republishing, but have not found time to do so. Having now the opportunity of sending it

forth again on its mission, I have decided to let it go as it is, making only a few verbal changes and omitting a few lines. Nothing that has been written since it appeared, makes it necessary to alter any of its statements. My own views therein expressed remain the same and the years have only strenghtened my faith in the great doctrine of Inspiration. The testimonies of many good judges who have read it lead me to believe that it supplied and will still supply a real need, and the increasing virulence of the attacks upon the old positions make it more necessary that the arguments set forth therein, should be familiar to all who hold and wish to uphold the old Faith.

One would have wished to deal more fully with the claims, baseless as we believe, of the Higher Critics, for I feel that many Christian people do not yet realize how subversive these are of all true belief in the Inspiration and Authority of the Old Testament, but I have recently completed a course of Lectures dealing more specifically with that subject which I hope ere long to publish.

Meanwhile I venture to hope that this reissue will help to enlighten the honest enquirer after Truth, to confirm the wavering, and to strenghten the hands of all who stand "For the Word of God and the Testimony of Jesus Christ."

ARCHIBALD M<sup>C</sup>CAIG.



# CONTENTS.

---

## PART I.

### *THE DOCTRINE DISCUSSED.*

LECTURE	PAGE
I. CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AS PROVING ITS DIVINE AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION - -	1
II. CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT PROVING THE EXTENT OF THE INSPIRATION—PLENARY AND VERBAL	19
III. CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT DISPROVING THE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM (1) AS TO ITS HISTORICAL VERACITY AND ACCURACY ; (2) AS TO THE ORIGIN OF JEWISH INSTITUTIONS -	33
IV. CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT DISPROVING THE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM, (3) AS TO THE AUTHORSHIP OF PARTICULAR BOOKS	53
V. THE APOSTLES' USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, PROVING ITS AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION - - -	72
VI. THE APOSTLES' USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, PROVING THE EXTENT OF THE INSPIRATION AND THE UNSOUNDNESS OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM AS TO THE HISTORICAL ACCURACY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT -	97
VII. THE APOSTLES' TESTIMONY AS TO THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF CERTAIN BOOKS - - - -	123

## LECTURE

PAGE

VIII. THE FACT OF INSPIRATION PREDICATED OF SCRIPTURE— THE FULNESS OF INSPIRATION CLAIMED BY SCRIPTURE	139
IX. THE FORM OF THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION WARRANTED BY SCRIPTURE	163

## PART II.

*THE DOCTRINE DEFENDED.*

X. THE SUPPOSED IMPOSSIBILITY OF A BOOK REVELATION.— ALLEGED UNWORTHY AND CONTRADICTORY REPRESENTATIONS OF GOD	187
XI. ALLEGED IMMORALITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	204
XII. ALLEGED INCORRECT HISTORICAL ALLUSIONS.—ALLEGED UNSCIENTIFIC STATEMENTS	225
XIII. ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES AND CONTRADICTIONS	246
XIV. MORE ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES AND CONTRADICTIONS	268
XV. VARIATIONS IN THE ACCOUNTS.—QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.—PAUL'S SO-CALLED DISCLAIMER OF INSPIRATION	286
XVI. VARIOUS READINGS IN MSS., AND POSSIBLE ERRORS IN TRANSCRIPTION.—GENERAL SUMMARY	305

PART I.  
*THE DOCTRINE DISCUSSED.*

---

LECTURE I.

CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AS PROVING ITS DIVINE  
AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION.

THERE are various ways of approaching the study of the subject of Inspiration; perhaps the simplest is to take the Gospels as true histories, and, after examining and accepting the claims of Christ, let His opinion be our guide. That the Synoptical Gospels are genuine records of the life of Christ is admitted by the most rationalistic critics, who also admit the genuineness of the main Epistles of Paul. It is not putting the case very strongly to say that these writings are as well attested as the history of Cæsar or Tacitus, and the Epistles of Cicero or Pliny. Had we no other New Testament records, these would be amply sufficient to establish the claims of Christ as the Divine Saviour, the Incarnate, Atoning, Risen, and Glorified Lord; while the existence of the Christian Church and ordinances from the time of Christ, and all the doctrines of the Christian faith, can be demonstrated from the same writings. Of course, with the most of professing Christians, we go farther, and consider that the whole of the New Testament is sufficiently



authenticated to be received as equally worthy of our trust; so that in our inquiry into the matter of Inspiration, we take the witness of the New Testament as a whole. It would be impossible at this time to discuss the subject of the New Testament Canon, but we certainly see no reason to question the faith of the Christian Church concerning it. But even if the testimony of the books which the most advanced thinkers leave to us were alone considered, the conclusion arrived at would not, in the main, be different.

We shall begin by considering the testimony which Christ bears to the Old Testament, and then examine the testimony of the writers of the New Testament, finding as we do so that they themselves possess the Spirit of Inspiration in accordance with the promise of Christ. When we have seen the Old Testament thus authenticated, we may look more closely at the evidence which both sections afford as to the nature of Inspiration, and then proceed to notice the objections brought against the doctrine which we believe the Book itself warrants us in holding—the doctrine popularly known as *Plenary and Verbal Inspiration*. We do not wish to twist the Scriptures to agree with our doctrine, but we hold the doctrine because, from repeated examination, we believe the Scriptures teach it. The question which we have to consider in this lecture is, What evidence do the Gospel narratives represent Christ as furnishing to the truth and authority of the Old Testament? We speak not now of the direct testimony of the Evangelists themselves to the authority of that venerable volume, though that also is important—as, for example, the opening chapters of Matthew are, to a great extent, unmeaning apart from the Old Testament—but we look only at the statements of Christ Himself.

In that charming glimpse of the boyhood of Jesus given by Luke, we see the habit of reverence for the Word of God already in force. He is among the Doctors, 'both hearing them and asking them questions'—questions, I doubt not, concerning that Word which it was the business of these Doctors of Divinity to expound.

Not to press that unduly, we pass on to the opening of His ministry, and we find that, in His conflict with the great enemy, His reliance is on the Word 'It is written,' and His trust in that Word makes Him triumphant. *mett. 4*

In that marvellous Sermon on the Mount, He frequently quotes, and constantly alludes to, the Old Testament, while He also makes the explicit declaration: 'Think not that I came to destroy the law, or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished.' Coming down from the mountain, the leper meets Him, seeks and obtains a cure, and is then told by the Great Healer to go show himself to the priest, and 'offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.'

In the synagogue of Nazareth, the Book of the Prophet Isaiah is handed to Him, and, as one familiar with its contents, He at once turns to ch. lxi., and reads that wondrous description of His own mission: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He anointed Me to preach good tidings to the poor; He hath sent Me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord' (Luke iv. 18, 19).

In the course of the wonder-inspiring sermon which He preaches from these words, He makes distinct reference to

the Scripture account of Elijah, the three years' famine, and the widow of Sidon; and to the healing of Naaman the leper, in the time of Elisha the prophet.

When the Pharisees complain of His familiarity with publicans and sinners, He justifies His conduct by a quotation from Hosea: 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice;' and, in harmony with the spirit of that passage, He could say: 'For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners' (Matt. ix. 13).

In sending forth His disciples, He speaks of the doom which would overtake those who rejected their words, and gives point to His utterance by an allusion to the great historic judgment of the olden time as recorded in Genesis: 'Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city' (Matt. x. 15).

In answer to the disciples of John, He recounts as proofs of His Messiahship the very works foretold by the prophets of old; and to the multitude concerning John, He says: 'This is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send My messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee' (Matt. xi. 10); while He also asserts that John is the 'Elijah which,' according to the prophets, 'is to come.'

In upbraiding the cities of Galilee for their impenitence, He refers to the awful doom of Tyre and Sidon foreshadowed in prophecy, which, by the time He spoke, had passed into history; and, again, He speaks of the judgment upon Sodom (Matt. xi. 20-24).

When the Pharisees, seeing the disciples plucking the ears of corn, charge them with breaking the Sabbath, their Master justifies them by a threefold Scripture reference.



He refers them to the incident recorded in the Book of Samuel, of David and his men eating of the shewbread; He reminds them of the permission given by the law for the performance of priestly service on the Sabbath; and He again quotes that important word from Hosea: 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice' (Matt. xii. 1-8).

When the Scribes and Pharisees seek a sign, He tells them that no sign shall be given save the sign of the Prophet Jonah, finding a type of His death and resurrection in the Scriptural account of that prophet's sojourn for three days in the belly of the sea-monster, and a contrast to the conduct of these cavillers in the ready repentance of the men of Nineveh at the preaching of Jonah; still further enforcing His warning by reference to the account given in the Book of Chronicles of the visit of Sheba's queen to the court of Solomon (Matt. xii. 39-42).

When the disciples ask Him why He speaks in parables, His answer is not complete without a Scriptural quotation: 'And unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall in no wise perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest haply they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and should turn again, and I should heal them' (Matt. xiii. 14, 15).

When the Pharisees charge His disciples with transgressing the traditions of the elders, He at once turns the tables upon the accusers, showing that *they*, by their traditions, transgressed the commandment of God (this is a most instructive passage, to which we shall have occasion to

return by-and-by), the special commandment to which He alludes being the fifth: 'For God said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death.' He shows them that His condemnation of them had already been anticipated: 'Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophecy of you, saying, This people honoureth Me with their lips; but their heart is far from Me. But in vain do they worship Me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men' (Matt. xv. 1-9). While thus denouncing their traditional observances, He submits to every Scriptural practice; and so when the collectors come for the 'half shekel,' the temple tribute—the atonement-money levied according to the ordinance recorded in Exodus—He willingly pays it (Matt. xvii. 24-27).

When questioned about the law of divorce, He refers to the Bible account of the creation of male and female, and directly quotes from Gen. ii.: 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh' (Matt. xix. 4, 5). To the lawyer who asks, 'What shall I do to inherit eternal life?' He says, 'What is written in the law? how readest thou?' and upon the inquirer quoting from Deuteronomy the summary of the law, He replies: 'Thou hast answered right' (Luke x. 25-29). He reminds the young ruler, who asks a similar question, of the claims of that same written law, and Himself cites the various commandments (Matt. xix. 16-19).

To the Pharisees scoffing at Him when they heard His parable of the unrighteous steward, He declares: 'The law and the prophets were until John. . . . But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fail' (Luke xvi. 16, 17). In the parable of the rich

man and Lazarus, He makes Abraham say: 'They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them' (Luke xvi. 29). He tells the ten lepers, as he had told the first one, in accordance with the law of Moses, to go and show themselves to the priests. He illustrates the great truth of His second advent by the story of Noah, and the judgment of the Flood, by the story of Lot, and the judgment upon Sodom; and especially alludes to the striking fate which overtook 'Lot's wife' (Luke xvii. 22-32).

As He is about to enter Jerusalem at the close of His ministry, He sends His disciples for the ass and her colt, that it might be fulfilled that was spoken by the prophet: 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee; meek, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass' (Matt. xxi. 5). When He enters the temple, and casts out those who defiled it, He grounds His action upon: 'It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer; but ye make it a den of robbers;' while to the indignant priests, complaining of the songs of the children, since they dared not find fault with His doings, He says: 'Yea; did ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?' So, after He tells them the parable of the vineyard—a parable manifestly founded upon Isaiah v.—He says: 'Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner; this was from the Lord, and it is marvellous in our eyes' (Matt. xxi. 13, 16, 42).

When the Sadducees propound their problem about the resurrection, He says, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures,' and He supports His own solution of the problem by a



Scripture quotation, saying, 'Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' When the lawyer, tempting Him, asks the question, 'Which is the great commandment of the law?' He at once falls back upon the Scripture declaration, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. . . . Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself:' while all His questioners are silenced by the difficulty of answering His own great question in harmony with the Psalm which He quotes, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I put thine enemies underneath thy feet' (Matt. xxii.).

His terrible denunciation of the Pharisees, as recorded in Matt. xxiii. and Luke xi., is full of Scriptural allusions, including the reference to the death of Abel and Zacharias. In His predictions concerning the fate of Jerusalem, He cites Daniel as speaking of the 'abomination of desolation' 'standing in the holy place,' and again refers to the deluge in the days of Noah (Matt. xxiv. 15, 37, 38). He had repeatedly told His disciples that it was in accordance with the Scriptures that He should suffer many things. As the dread hour of His agony approaches, He again and again insists upon this fact: 'For I say unto you that this which is written must be fulfilled in Me, and He was reckoned with the transgressors.' 'All ye shall be offended in Me this night; for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.' 'All this is come to pass that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled.' When He enters into the cloud and

the horror of great darkness falls upon Him, He can find no language to express His feelings save the opening words of Psalm xxii., 'Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?' while, in all probability, the last verse of the same Psalm is alluded to in His triumphant proclamation, 'It is finished'; and His last word on the cross is a sentence of Scripture: 'Into Thy hands I commend My spirit.'

These instances of the quotation of Scripture by our Lord are all found in the Synoptical Gospels, and while many of them also occur in the fourth Gospel, we find in it several which are not given in the others. The briefest allusion to these will suffice. In John i. we have the reference to Jacob's vision. In ch. iii. He cites as an illustration of the Gospel, the incident of the lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness. In ch. v. He speaks highly of Moses' writings, and shows that they testify of Himself. In ch. vi. He speaks of the manna; in ch. vii. of Moses giving the law, and of the institution of circumcision. In ch. viii. He frequently speaks of Abraham. In ch. x. He defends Himself from the charge of blasphemy by the quotation, 'Ye are gods.' In ch. xv. He finds in the disposition of His enemies a confirmation of the Scripture, 'They hated Me without a cause'; and in His prayer in ch. xvii. He considers the case of Judas as the fulfilment of prophecy.

No summary of Christ's references to the Old Testament would be complete without those important statements in the closing chapter of Luke's Gospel, 'Beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself.' 'All things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of

Moses and the prophets and the psalms concerning Me. Then opened He their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures.'

It may be somewhat tedious to run through these familiar details, but I think it is, in these days, distinctly desirable that we should have a clear idea of the fulness and variety of the testimony of the Great Teacher to the truth of the Old Testament. It will be seen by a consideration of these passages that He quotes particular writers by name—as Moses, David, Isaiah, Daniel, Jonah. Particular books are cited, though not by name—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Hosea, Jonah, Zechariah, Malachi, while allusion is made to others. Biblical characters are mentioned—Abel, Noah, Lot, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha. Special institutions are recognised—The Sabbath, Circumcision, Marriage, the Law of the Leper's cleansing. To crown all He speaks of the books as a whole by the titles familiarly applied to them by the Jews: 'The Law,' 'The Law and the Prophets,' 'Moses and all the Prophets,' 'The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms.' Now, all this shows how large a place the Old Testament occupied in the thoughts of Christ, and we are warranted in asserting that HIS ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE OLD TESTAMENT PROVES ITS DIVINE AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION.

Many of the modern rejecters of the doctrine of full Inspiration claim to give deep reverence to Christ Himself. They profess to submit to His authority as the loftiest, and in so doing minimize the importance of Scripture. We, too, appeal to Christ. We are anxious to



go direct to Him. What does that imply? Is belief in the Book antagonistic to the supremest confidence in Christ? Does the most absolute submission to Him render the Written Word less authoritative? We trow not. Yielding as we gladly and fully do to the Christ of God, we find that He attributes the fullest authority to these Old Testament records; and just because we submit to Him, just because we reverence His opinion, we give that Word the same place which He gives it. From the passages quoted we see that He constantly bowed to the authority of the Word. This is the more significant when we see that He was frequently in collision with the religious authorities of His own day. He did not recognise as authoritative some of the writings which the Jews honoured. He repudiated altogether as worthless and dangerous the traditions of the elders, charging them with making the Word of God of none effect through their tradition. The '*Word of God*' was the one standard of appeal. He taught His disciples to give heed to the Scribes when sitting in 'Moses' seat'; when they made known the Word of God itself, they were to be honoured and obeyed, but their example in acting contrary to that Word was not to be copied. He founded Himself on no rabbi's dictum. He spake out of the fulness of His own authority. Throughout He assumes Divine authority for His own utterances, and, surely, no one who believes in Christ should question that authority, and He places the Old Testament on a level with these. Yea, He justifies His boldest statements by an appeal to the Old Testament.

The *Divine Inspiration* of these writings is, of course, involved in their Authority. Christ could not have attributed

Divine authority to writings not Divinely given. Only that which is of God can command the reverence of the human soul. How manifestly must the Scriptures be from God, when the Son of God so gladly and fully submitted to them! Taking our stand by the side of Christ, and treating the Scriptures as He treated them, we need not be troubled at the charge of Bibliolatry which may be brought against us. The charge might as truly be levelled at Christ. I am not prepared to say that the charge may justly be brought against none of the believers in Inspiration; nor do I think that orthodox Evangelicalism ought to be held responsible for all the crudities which may have been promulgated in its name; but I do believe that no intelligent Evangelical attaches greater importance to the letter of the Scripture than the Lord Jesus Christ attached to it. Every time He makes a quotation, He as good as says 'This is the veritable word of God; deny it at your peril.' He always in quoting gives the impression that He is dealing with a Divine Word which ought to settle every question in dispute. He admits no appeal beyond it; and His hearers are at one with Him in that respect. They admit the force of the quotation even though it may tell against them. They may not always be convinced, and may sometimes be disposed to question His application of particular passages: they never question the truth and authority of the passage itself. The Law and the Prophets were to them supreme, but not more so than to Christ. We have seen how frequently He referred to a particular prophecy as being fulfilled; to a particular statement as finding its application; and how constantly He rested upon 'the Law and the Prophets' as a whole. This He did, not simply in quoting and applying old truths, but

even in advancing distinctly fresh forms of Gospel truth; for instance, when He gives utterance to that profoundly beautiful aphorism, rightly named the golden rule, which is so characteristic of the dispensation which He introduced, He does not claim for it absolute originality, but affirms that it is in harmony with, and is but a fuller unfolding of the spirit of the Old Testament, 'For this is the law and the prophets.'

To refer again to the passage in John x. 34, 35, we see that Christ considered the Inspiration as inseparable from the Authority of the Old Testament. The name He most frequently gives it is 'Scripture,' and here that epithet is shown to be synonymous with the more specific title, '*Word of God.*' 'Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods?' The spoken word has passed into the written, and at lowest, the one is the record of the other. 'If He called them gods unto whom the Word of God came,' then Exodus xxii. is part of the Word of God; then Psalm lxxxii. is part of the Word of God. Now mark what follows: instead of saying the 'Word of God' is sure, He varies the expression, and says, 'and the *Scripture* cannot be broken.' Then the *Scripture is the* WORD OF GOD, and the Scripture cannot be BROKEN, cannot be loosed, cannot have its authority impaired, its binding force dissolved. *It must stand.* Not a jot or tittle can pass away till all be fulfilled. Human scriptures, writings which are the word of man, can be broken, have been broken, are constantly being broken. The early history of Greece and Rome has been revised, reconstructed, rewritten by modern historians. The ancient systems of philosophy have been exploded and discredited. Religious opinions, which once held the world in thrall,



have been dethroned and disowned. Fuller research may break in pieces the most beautifully-constructed of human theories; in the light of clearer knowledge the most stable of human conclusions may melt away; and with much truth the poet may sing:

‘Yet I doubt not thro’ the ages one increasing purpose runs,  
And the thoughts of men are widen’d with the process of the suns;’

but *‘the counsel of the Lord standeth fast for ever; the thoughts of His heart to all generations.’* THE SCRIPTURE CANNOT BE BROKEN.

In view of Christ’s habitual deference to the Scriptures, what are we to think of the following statement by a popular writer (Rev. Dr. Horton) on Inspiration? ‘We keep vividly in our minds the evil example of the Jews, against whom our Lord brought the charge, “Ye search the Scriptures because ye think that in them ye have eternal life . . . and ye will not come to Me that ye may have life.” We are reminded that to us, as to the Jews, the Scriptures may be a positive hindrance if we make them a substitute for coming to Christ; and we are content, believing that they are the witnesses of Him, to value them just in proportion as they deliver that witness, and to undervalue those parts which do not testify to Him clearly, positively rejecting any part which is contrary to Him.’ In this sentence there is a strange mixture of good and evil, wise and otherwise. We do not object to the rendering ‘Ye search,’ as given by the Revisers, instead of the ‘Search’ of the Authorized Version. The context must decide whether it is the imperative or indicative form of the verb, and commentators are pretty equally divided about it; but whatever rendering we adopt, it is clear that Christ does not blame these Jews for search-

ing the Scriptures. His whole language suggests that it was a praiseworthy practice; what He blames them for is that they would not come to Him, of whom the Scriptures testified. The language of the writer might be taken as meaning just that, only, unfortunately, the whole trend of his book is in the direction of undervaluing the Inspiration of the Scriptures. When he speaks of the danger of making the Scriptures a substitute for coming to Christ, he is only uttering a warning which believers in the full Inspiration have often given; but it is a warning which no intelligent believer in the old doctrine needs. It is the latter part of the statement, however, that is so objectionable, although it is not without plausibility. 'To undervalue those parts which do not testify to Him clearly, positively rejecting any part which is contrary to Him.' Christ says, 'They are they which testify of Me.' He nowhere hints that some parts are to be undervalued as giving an obscure testimony; still less does He allow us to assume that any part is contrary to Him. A witness may give some part of his testimony with greater clearness than other parts, and the clearer portions may be more helpful to us, and we may be disposed to attach to them more importance; but we need not, and ought not, on that account, to undervalue the other portions in the sense of deeming them less truthful; and that seems to be the meaning of the words as used by our author.

We take our stand upon Christ's statement that the Scriptures *as a whole* testify of Him. May it not be that where we do not perceive the testimony, the fault is in our vision? 'Beginning at Moses and from all the prophets, He interpreted to them, in *all the Scriptures*, the things concerning Himself.' 'Then opened He their mind

that they might understand the Scriptures.' Had we Christ now to interpret the Scriptures to us, had we His touch to open our mind, might we not see much more of Him in all the Scriptures? His recorded interpretations have revealed Him in places where the Jews saw Him not; and His disciples, whose minds were opened by Him, have taught us that law and ritual, prophecy and psalm, history and vision, are all full of Him. The testimonies are cumulative, hence what might seem trivial or unimportant when isolated or detached, in its true place as part of the whole, is lifted into importance, and becomes essential to the completeness of the testimony.

As to any part being 'contrary to Him,' how utterly foreign is the thought to the mind of Christ! If a witness contradicts himself or utters statements which are proved to be false, then we cannot attach much value to his testimony as a whole. He is, as a witness, discredited. Dr. Horton tries to prove that in all parts of the Bible there are discrepancies, contradictions, involuntary errors, and wilful mistakes. Even those books which contain the clearest testimonies to Christ are considered to partake of these grave imperfections. Surely if that were so, Christ could not with such satisfaction point to those books as witnesses of Him. Surely He would be very suspicious of their testimony. So far from the Scriptures bearing imperfect or contradictory testimony, Christ in that same passage of John says, 'If ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me; for he wrote of Me; but if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?' This, by the way, shows that they were not blamed for resting in the Scriptures, but for not understanding them so as to see Christ through them;

this is shown to be equivalent to not believing. But the point I notice now is the very high place He here assigns to the writings of Moses. As if these writings were so manifestly of God that those who did not believe them could not be expected to believe the words of the Son of God Himself, or perhaps indicating that their clear testimony was so necessary that if it were rejected Christ Himself could not be understood or accepted. How different this from the idea of rejecting any part of these writings as 'contrary to Him'!

In the light of Christ's testimony let me put before you another quotation from Dr. Horton's book. Speaking of the fancied advantage of recognising that in many cases the authorship of particular books is doubtful—and I may say that he seeks to cast doubt upon most of them—he says, 'Things which pass as the sayings of a great man have an exaggerated weight; ideas which come to us as the products of the thought of Solomon, the wisest of men, have the air of finality which overawes us; suffered to stand upon their own bottom, they assume a less perilous pre-eminence.' To this, for one thing, we say that it is not because we believe certain books to be written by Moses, or Solomon, or Isaiah, that we value them, but because we believe that these books, and others by less prominent men, and some which are confessedly by anonymous writers, were all written under the guidance and control of the Spirit of God. Their air of finality—to us, at least—is not due to their being 'the product of the thought of a Solomon' or any other great man, but because they give us 'the thoughts of God.' They come to us bearing the Divine stamp, and that is to us of far more importance than the royal stamp of David or Solomon. That Divine stamp we see Christ recognising,



and so we have no doubt of its reality. But how suggestive is the last phrase, '*perilous pre-eminence*'! And the whole book seems designed and calculated to bring down the Scriptures from the pre-eminence which they have ever assumed in the estimation of the people of God. A sufficient answer to such unworthy language is found in Christ's treatment of the Sacred Writings. He undoubtedly placed them in a position of *pre-eminence*, but we fail to see what peril is involved in that pre-eminence; while we greatly fear that those who seek to take them down from the position of pre-eminence which Christ assigns them are engaged in a 'perilous' task. Christ's whole teaching with regard to the Scriptures is but an echo of the prophetic cry, 'To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them'; and with His practice we are in perfect accord when we acknowledge their glorious pre-eminence, and say with Watts:

'This is the judge that ends the strife  
Where wit and reason fail.'

## LECTURE II.

### CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT PROVING THE EXTENT OF THE INSPIRATION—PLENARY AND VERBAL.

WE have seen that the attitude of Christ towards the Old Testament Scriptures proves their Divine Inspiration and Authority. We need no other warrant for holding them in high esteem; and it is, indeed, a cause of peculiar satisfaction to find that while to-day many think and speak slightingly of the Old Testament—or, at least, of a great part of it—Christ sets the seal of His approval upon it. The love of our fathers for the grand old Book is thus amply justified, and our attachment to the same Book is no mistaken credulity. We are glad to know that even the critics admit that we have the same Old Testament which Christ had, so that as we mark His constant study of it, His deep love for it, His ready submission to it, we can assure ourselves that it is our privilege to love, study, and obey the self-same Word of Truth. But there are many who agree with us in saying that Christ treated the Old Testament as Divinely Inspired and Authoritative, who deny that the Inspiration extends to every part of it.

We, therefore, next inquire what answer does Christ's treatment of the Scriptures warrant us to give to the question, *To what extent are the Scriptures inspired?* I believe

that nothing less than *Plenary and Verbal* Inspiration will account for His use of them.

Without at present dwelling upon considerations drawn from the region of metaphysics as to the necessary connection between thought and language, we note that in general Christ deals with the language, the words, of Scripture. He never gives any ground for the supposition that He considered only the *thought* to be from God, while the words were humanly chosen and subject to error. He frequently condemned the unscriptural teaching and practice of the Jews. He often corrected the mistaken conceptions of His disciples, but He never professes to *correct* the Scriptures themselves. He often shows the importance of studying the Scriptures; He never suggests a suspicion of their accuracy. He says to the Sadducees, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures'; He never hints that the Scriptures in any particular can err. He always treats them as possessing infallibility, and infallibility could not be apart from the language.

Doubtless, it was the thought enshrined in the language which He valued, just as language is valued in proportion to the worth of the thought of which it is the vehicle; but He evidently considered that the accuracy of the language was necessary to the adequate expression of the thought. So it was His care to give the people the exact meaning of the passages, so that sometimes in quoting He might give a freer rendering; but often much of the stress of His argument lies upon the exact words of the cited text. The formula used in the temptation and elsewhere, '*It is written,*' is suggestive, indicating that not simply the purport of Scripture is inspired and of Divine authority, but the form

in which it has been transmitted, the very language of the record, is Divinely authorized.

In that temptation scene, His whole argument largely turns upon the very words used: 'Man shall not live by bread *alone*.' Bread does support the life of man, and it may truly be said of the lower life that man lives by bread; but the truest life is not supported by bread—the higher life must be sustained by what proceedeth from the mouth of God; so that only in a partial and very inferior sense can he live by bread—in the fullest and noblest sense he cannot 'LIVE by *bread alone*.' 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.' The one glorious object of worship is thus exalted, and the suggestion of the evil one utterly defeated; the limiting words are the decisive words. Again, 'Thou shalt not *tempt* the Lord thy God.' 'Tempt' is the very word that meets the case; we could imagine other words being used which would be all right and proper—thou shalt not disobey, dishonour, displease, blaspheme, forget God; but what Satan asked Him to do was a 'tempting of Providence,' and no other word of Scripture could so exactly rebut the proposal of the tempter as this: 'Thou shalt not *tempt* the Lord thy God.'

It is interesting to notice in the same connection that when Satan attempts to quote Scripture, he entirely alters the meaning of the passage cited by the suppression of one little phrase: 'He shall give His angels charge over thee to keep thee,' says he; but the Scripture saith, 'to keep thee *in all thy ways*'; and by leaving out that defining clause, and turning it into an absolute promise, Satan could plausibly urge Christ to do what he asked. But Christ knew that that promise only guaranteed safe keeping for the



child of God while in the ways of God's appointing, and to act as the devil suggested would be going out of God's way, and so be a tempting of God.

May we not say, too, that Christ's great statement in the Sermon on the Mount points in the direction of Verbal Inspiration? 'One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished.' Evidently it is not simply the great fundamental revelation contained in the law that He means, but even its minutest claims as *expressed* in the most unimportant demands—demands which are necessarily expressed in words; and while, of course, Christ refers to the *essence* of the whole—and His statement may be taken as enunciating a general principle about the law in its entirety—yet the very language used by Him directs attention to the minutiae of the written Word.

Law, especially, must be particular about words. Bills in passing through Parliament are severely scrutinized as to the wording of them—many a debate arises upon particular phrases and words; and when a Bill has received the Royal Assent, and, as an Act of Legislature, has become part of the statute law of the realm, it is interpreted by the courts according to the literal, grammatical meaning of the words. Law text-books must be particular—as, indeed, text-books of any science must be particular—in the use and definition of words and terms. Lawyers and judges in citing cases have to rely upon the particular words in which any given judgment has been declared. So, surely, in this Divine Statute Book, the words in which the laws of God are expressed are of importance; and in considering the application of these laws in historical cases, regard must be paid to the wording of the records.

Evidently in such a spirit of reverence for the law did Christ thus speak. I need hardly say, for I suppose even our junior brethren know, that by the 'jot' is meant literally the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet, the Yod (י)=the Greek *ιώτα*, which those of you who are not familiar with the Hebrew character may see at the heading of the tenth section of *Psa. cxix. 73*. By the 'tittles' are meant the little horns or points which distinguish certain letters which are much alike. Those of you who have manfully mastered the mysteries of the Hebrew alphabet, know how necessary it is to observe these distinctions, and if our junior brethren will at their leisure examine the letters as given at the headings of *Psa. cxix., Revised Version*, noting particularly Beth and Caph, Daleth and Resh, Vau and Nun, Cheth and Tau, they will see how important a part these small tittles play. The absence of one of these tittles in a word might make a very great difference in the meaning. Take at random a few words: *אָבָר* is, 'he perished'; *אֵבֶר*, 'a wing': *אֶחָד*, 'one'; *אַחֵר*, 'after': *רָבָה*, 'an evil report'; *רַבָּה*, 'to multiply': *דָּגֵל* is 'a standard'; *רֶגֶל* is 'a foot': *יָדָד*, 'beloved' *יָרַד*, 'to descend.'

Christ not only asserts the value of the law in all its details, but He also pronounces condemnation upon anyone who should undervalue any part of it: 'Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven;' while a corresponding blessing rests upon the man who, following His example, gives due honour to every part: 'But whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.'

The text of the sermon in the synagogue of Nazareth is

notable for its omission as much as for what it expresses. The prophet in one sentence says: 'To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God;' but Christ breaks off the quotation in the middle of the sentence. Had He read the whole, He could not with strict accuracy have said: 'This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears.' It was absolutely true that He had been anointed for His ministry of blessing, and that He was proclaiming the 'acceptable year of the Lord'; but 'the day of vengeance of our God' had not yet dawned—hence the pause in the quotation. In the quotations which follow, the point of application is found in the historical fact that there was but *one widow* to whom Elijah was sent for sustenance, and but *one leper*—Naaman the Syrian—cleansed in the days of Elisha.

In the quotation from Malachi concerning John the Baptist, the exact description of John and his mission is found in the words '*My messenger, to prepare thy way.*'

Not only is the historical account of Jonah accepted without question, but the definite statement about the 'three days and three nights' is seen to contain special typical teaching concerning Christ's own resurrection.

The literal accuracy of the prophetic statement about 'hearing' and yet 'not understanding,' 'seeing' and 'not perceiving,' is fully realized in the experience of those unbelieving Jews who were privileged to hear Christ's parables. And, again, the very word 'parable,' as occurring in Psa. lxxviii., with the meaning there attached to it, is the word which best suits the phase of His teaching to which Christ applies it.

The very words of Isaiah describe the people of Christ's

day, und warrant Him to address them as hypocrites, 'honouring' God with the 'lips,' while the 'heart' was far from Him.

His entry into Jerusalem fulfils the prophecy in its minutest details—'riding upon an *ass*, and upon a *colt* the foal of an ass.'

The biting question addressed to the chief priests, 'Did ye never read in the Scriptures?' lost none of its point from the fact that the exact words of Scripture carried with them their condemnation, and foreshadowed the triumph of Him whom they now opposed—the *stone* (how frequently this suggestive word is applied to Christ throughout the New Testament, setting Him forth in a most attractive aspect!) *rejected* by the *builders*. These men claiming to be, and in their official capacity actually being, the builders in God's house, have their unbelief, folly, and crime thus characterized in that most pregnant and appropriate word *rejected*. Then, how exactly descriptive of the subsequent exaltation of the rejected Christ is the phrase 'made the head of the corner'! while the true source of His triumph is most tersely and beautifully pointed out as 'from the Lord,' and the feelings of those who rightly view the matter could not have a better summary than this, 'it is marvellous in our eyes.'

So, too, to these same chief priests that other quotation, prefaced by the same stinging question, 'Did ye never read?' derived all its point to disarm their querulous and angry criticism from the specific mention of '*babes* and *sucklings*.'

Perhaps the most striking instance of the importance which Christ attached to the minutest words of Scripture is His citation of Exod. iii. 6, with His profound comment



upon it in refutation of the Sadducees, 'I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'; 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' No one disputes the fact that the whole of Christ's argument is built upon the use (implied) of the present rather than the past tense of the verb. God might have said to Moses, 'I was the God of Abraham,' and that would have been perfectly true and sufficient to have inspired Moses with confidence, but that expression would not have lent any support to the reasoning of Christ in this important matter. Nor would the theory that the Inspiration only attaches to the thought, that the substance but not the form is Divine, avail here. It might well be said by anyone, dealing simply with the statement in Exodus, that the thought conveyed is simply that God had been the Helper of these patriarchs, and in the same way would be an all-sufficient support to Moses; that, the expositor might say, is the inspired thought, and it fully meets the case, we must not suppose that the exact wording of it is of importance. But when Christ comes to deal with it, it is the very *form* of the sentiment that He notices. All that the main thought meant to Moses was already understood and accepted by the Sadducees, but Christ by directing attention to the individual words establishes the important doctrine of the resurrection. If He *is* the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, then they, too, *are*—He would not be God of those who had passed into non-existence; they *live* unto Him, and the fact of their present life is the pledge and the postulate of their future resurrection. Thus, the very tense of the substantive verb is seen to throb with wondrous meaning, and leaps into far-reaching importance.

So, too, it is the subtle force of one little word that utterly baffles and puts to ignominious silence His cunning questioners. 'The Lord said unto *my* Lord,' and our Hebrew students will remember that the 'my' is represented in the Hebrew by that smallest letter of the alphabet, the Yod or jot of which we have before spoken. It is because David represents Jehovah addressing the Messiah as '*my* (David's) Lord,' that the theory of the Pharisees that Messiah was to be David's son utterly breaks down. It was true as far as it went. Christ does not deny it. But it did not go far enough; it did not account for the Divinity of the Messiah, and by directing their attention to that one apparently trivial expression, '*My* Lord,' Christ presses upon them the necessity of reconstructing their Messianic doctrine.

When to illustrate the coming judgment the Lord alludes to the doom of the antediluvian world and of the cities of the plain, the universality of the judgment upon the ungodly is indicated by the significant expression as applied to those outside the ark and those inside the doomed cities, 'destroyed them *all*.' And when He further warns against going back to save any of their household goods in the coming destruction of Jerusalem, and enforces His warning by an allusion to the fate of Lot's wife, the pith of that allusion is found in the exact words of the record, although He does not quote them, 'His wife looked back.'

When He forewarns His disciples of how they will behave in the hour of His apprehension, He finds in the prophecy of Zechariah the very word that is applicable to the situation, the shepherd smitten and the sheep '*scattered*.'

Again, how fitly, in view of His approaching doom, is that word used, '*reckoned* with the transgressors'! He was not a

transgressor; He was not made a transgressor; but He was *reckoned* with transgressors and treated as a transgressor.

So that pathetic cry from the cross, the mournful echo of Psa. xxii., in its every word exactly depicts the mysterious experience of the sin-bearing Saviour—*My* God, *my* God, *why* hast *Thou forsaken ME?*’ You cannot alter a word without marring the ineffable pathos, or obscuring the lurid glory of the atoning Christ. I may point out what our Hebrew students will have noticed, that the insignificant Yod also plays an important part here. The ‘*My*,’ which so beautifully and touchingly indicates the intimate relationship existing between Christ and His Father, the surging agony of His soul in its new experience, and the clinging faith which in the very depths keeps hold of God—this ‘*My*’ is just the Hebrew Yod as you can see it in the Syriac form given in our text, ‘*Elī, Elī.*’ Again, it appears in the ‘*Me*,’ being the pronoun appended to the verb according to the Hebrew custom, and so represented to us in the Syriac ‘*Sabacthanī.*’ What an appropriate word, too, is that which we have fittingly rendered ‘*forsaken*’! Other words might express the truth of the situation, but no other, which is not a synonym, could express it so well. ‘*Why* hast *Thou* treated *Me* as guilty?’ ‘*Why* hast *Thou* punished *Me?*’ ‘*Why* hast *Thou* laid *Thy* wrath upon *Me?*’ All true, but ‘*Why* hast *Thou forsaken Me?*’ includes all and suggests more, and goes to the very essence of the rationale of the atonement, while it leaves the whole transaction shrouded in mystery, which our present mental vision can no more penetrate than could the eyes of the spectators pierce the dense darkness which for three solemn hours enswathed the place called Calvary.

I need do no more than remind you of the few passages specially reported in the Gospel of John. The illustration of the serpent in the wilderness is luminous with Gospel truth, but is not the light focussed in the incident of *lifting up*;<sup>2</sup> for there you have the distinct foreshadowing of the tragedy of the cross, with all its mystery of mercy, its burden of blessing.

The phrase in ch. x., which we considered at length in our last lecture, as establishing the Inspiration and Authority of the Scripture, is also of great weight in proof that the Inspiration extends to the words. 'Ye are *gods*'—that one word 'gods,' used in such a connection, is the hinge of Christ's reasoning; He can utterly overthrow their charge of blasphemy against Him for claiming to be the Son of God, by showing that in their own Scriptures the title 'gods' is applied in a subordinate sense to their rulers.

Speaking of Judas, He quotes the passage, 'He that eateth bread with Me hath lifted up his heel against Me.' What a faithful portrait of the betrayer, bringing into prominence these two features: intimate fellowship with Christ, traitorous rebellion against Him!

When, of His enemies, He said that, according to the Scriptures, they hated Him 'without a cause,' it is evident that the chief stress of the charge is upon that one word, for it is one word both in Hebrew and Greek, rendered '*without a cause*'—'they hated Me *gratuitously*.'

We have already seen how Christ found the fulfilment of Scripture in all the incidents of His Passion, and how in His deepest agony it is the language of Scripture which comes from His lips. In John xix. we have another striking instance. Emerging from the depths



of soul agony, and realizing the pangs of physical suffering, which perhaps had for the time been forgotten in the intenser distress of the soul, He cries, 'I thirst'; and this, the Evangelist tells us, was 'that the Scripture might be accomplished.' In Psa. lxix., as in Psa. xxii., there is a foreshadowing of the Messiah's sufferings, and this fact of thirsting is intimated as among the elements of the suffering, while it is also stated that vinegar was given Him in His thirst. Now, that the Scriptures in the details of this description might be accomplished, He gives expression to the very word '*I thirst*'; and unconscious of the importance of their action, the attendants give Him *vinegar*; and thus the old Scripture which speaks of the *thirsting* sufferer receiving the *vinegar* finds its actual and verbal fulfilment.

The importance of having a conspectus of these passages must be my excuse for this detailed examination of them, albeit it may have been a little tedious.

Surely any theory of Inspiration which does not regard the language as inspired fails to account for the way in which we have seen Christ applying the Word. We see that the authoritative character of that Word warrants Him in resting, when needs be, upon its minutest expressions. Verbal Inspiration could alone bear that strain.

Some tell us that parts of the Old Testament may be verbally inspired, but not all. But it is noteworthy that the quotations which we have given are taken from every class of the Old Testament writings.

What parts would our friends consider most fully inspired? The prophets? Christ certainly quotes very frequently from them, and does attach to them the fullest

possible Inspiration of thought and language. But what of the Pentateuch? No less frequently does He quote it, no less reverently does He treat it. Whether we look at Genesis, with its plain unvarnished tales; or Exodus, with its marvellous displays of supernatural power, its stirring episodes, its heaven-sent laws; or Numbers and Leviticus, with their types and rites; or Deuteronomy, with its legal, historical, and ethical commentary; the same phenomenon meets us—we find Christ quoting from each of the five books, and not simply by these quotations establishing the authority of the books, but in many cases proving, by reasoning from the form of expression, that the Inspiration of the books did indeed extend to the language. So with the other historical books, and so with the Psalms. Indeed, from some of these very Psalms, concerning which it has been said that the note of Inspiration is very low, notably *Psa. lxi.*, we find Christ thus quoting, and in the quotation pointing to the verbal exactness of the passages.

The fact is that Christ treats the Scriptures in their three-fold division of the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, as of equal authority; and when we find Him attributing, by His use of them, Verbal Inspiration to any of the parts, we are justified in predicating it of the whole. This is no ‘fallacy of extension’; it is simply regarding the Scriptures, as we find Christ regarded them, as a unity. Never for a moment does He give the slightest colour to the fancy that one part of Scripture is inspired in a less degree than another. He makes no apology for quoting from Genesis or Kings, any more than from the most spiritual of the Psalms or the most exalted flights of the Prophets. To Him all are the Scriptures of truth and the Word of God; and every

sentence and syllable may become the substratum of most important arguments.

Of course, what we have thus considered is but a part of the evidence which the New Testament furnishes in favour of the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration—other parts of the evidence will come before us when examining the Apostolic testimony; but it is of immense importance to find our Divine Teacher, the Peerless Prophet, the Faithful and True Witness, bearing such clear and emphatic testimony on this great theme. We shall do well to accept His testimony, and give heed to every detail of the Word of God.

### LECTURE III.

CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT DISPROVING THE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM (1) AS TO ITS HISTORICAL VERACITY AND ACCURACY; (2) AS TO THE ORIGIN OF JEWISH INSTITUTIONS.

NO thoughtful reader of the Gospel narratives can doubt that Christ considered the Old Testament Scriptures as Divinely Authoritative, and I think the passages we have examined make it also pretty certain that He held them to be fully Inspired in all the details of their language. There remains to be considered the question, What bearing has the testimony of Christ upon the Higher Criticism of to-day?

I cannot now treat of the Higher Criticism as a whole, but simply of those phases or portions of the theory which come into contact with the teaching of Christ—a contact which we consider to be in the nature of collision and conflict. It is somewhat difficult accurately to define the position of the Higher Critics, inasmuch as they are not by any means agreed among themselves. However, they generally agree in rejecting the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and, indeed, in denying the received opinion with regard to the authorship of most, if not all, of the books of the Bible. They generally agree in asserting

the composite character of most of the books—that is, that they consist of different and diverging documents, put together more or less artistically (generally less), by various editors. For instance, in the Pentateuch—or, as they are accustomed to call it, with the addition of the Book of Joshua, the ‘Hexateuch’—there are at least four different narratives by different authors, some of these, in turn, being composed of two or more separate documents, and the entire number thrown together, so as to form one book, by a gentleman called the Redactor, which is the critical name for an editor or a compiler. The process does not altogether stop there, for the whole may have been revised, and re-revised, by different redactors. To some extent the same style of compilation is predicated of the other books of Scripture.

Again, the Critics all agree in declaring that the different narrators contradict each other; that they often give a certain colour to an event to authorize a particular practice or course of conduct; that late writers and redactors, in recording long-past events, reflect upon these the spirit of their own age, and so represent them as of a different character from what they really were. It follows from this that there can be no guarantee of historical fidelity, especially when the writers are considered to be separated by many centuries from the events they record, the earliest being about 800 B.C., and some of them as late as 300 and even 200 B. C. There is considerable divergence among the Critics as represented in this country on this point. We have Robertson-Smith and Cheyne, closely following Wellhausen and Kuenen, speaking as if all the more ancient histories were myths or unreliable traditions, fancy pictures



or inventions. Driver more cautiously contends for a true historical element; but it is very hard to say what that historical element is. Horton, more cautious in some respects than Driver, though in other respects rasher, tries to preserve as much as possible of the old history; but even he speaks of myths in Genesis, and freely—yea, as he says, with a sense of relief—admits the objection that these writings ‘cannot be accepted as authoritative testimonies to the facts,’ and roundly asserts that many of the narratives are distinctly deficient in probability, that others are revolting, appalling in their barbarity, and not to be believed. We are not, therefore, misrepresenting the school when we say that it denies the *Historical Veracity and Accuracy of the Old Testament*.

Now, how stands the testimony of Christ in relation to his important question of the *Historical Accuracy of the Old Testament Scriptures*? I do not think I err in calling this an important question. I think the unsophisticated Christian mind must feel it to be so—must feel that truthfulness is an essential requisite in a historian—and will be slow to believe that men who could not accurately record, and did deliberately falsify, the history of their own race, can be trusted in dealing with matters pertaining to the unseen and the spiritual. If they cannot be trusted when reporting past affairs, can they be trusted when predicting future events? If they could palm off their own writings upon the people as the work of Moses, seeking, by sheltering themselves under a great name, to give authority to their productions, can we give credence to what they profess to utter as a Divine revelation? We are not so ready as Dr. Horton to believe that such men, if such they were, would be made

the vehicles of the Divine communications to men. We are really concerned as to their historical trustworthiness; for although it is true that much of that history does not practically concern us, yet the spiritual revelation contained in the Old Testament is bound up with the history, and stands or falls with it.

Now, surely, in our examination of Christ's quotations, we have found Him constantly assuming the *Historical Accuracy* of the Old Testament. To Him the Scripture was a unity—He quotes freely, and in the same tone, from any part of it; and we cannot suppose that He would have done so had all not been equally reliable. But let us look at some special indications of the assumption of such accuracy and reliability by Christ.

In Matt. xix., in answer to the tempting question of the Pharisees about divorce, Jesus says: 'Have ye not read, that He which made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall become one flesh?' If anywhere in Scripture we might look for myths, it would be in the opening chapters of Genesis, and strenuously have the Critics asserted that here they do find them. But our Lord treats these very chapters as historical; so much so that He can base upon the account of the origin of man His irrefragable argument, finding even in the record itself a distinct account of the first institution of marriage—an institution which is invested with perennial interest for man; and common-sense and true philosophy are satisfied with such an origin. If this be a myth, it is a myth which Christ and His hearers treated as possessing historical veracity, doctrinal validity,

and abiding authority, which is equivalent to saying that it is no myth, but a veritable history. Indeed, any unprejudiced reader of that early record must feel that it bears the marks of a plain, unvarnished tale, and, though moving in the region of the supernatural, makes no attempt to pander to the feeling of the marvellous, is equally removed from the absurdities of the legendary accounts of the origin of man as received by other nations, and from the vagaries of a quasi-scientific dream of evolution or spontaneous generation.

It is worth noting that, whereas the Critics assure us that we have two distinct accounts from different writers of the creation of man, and that these accounts are contradictory and irreconcilable, Christ does not seem at all conscious of any contradiction, and He actually in His quotation takes a sentence from the first chapter—the narrative of P, as the Critics term it—and combines with it a sentence from the narrative of J in the second chapter, evidently under the impression that He is dealing with a homogeneous narrative; and we dare not think that He was mistaken in that impression. Incidentally, this quotation by Christ furnishes a strong proof of the Inspiration of the entire narrative. Remember that in Genesis the second part of this quotation is given as the sentiment of the historian, or it may be part of Adam's statement—if the latter, it is that statement as recorded by the historian; but Christ says *He that made them said*, 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother.' Is that not adopting the record as Divine? Is it not assuming that through the writer *God said* all that is recorded in these chapters—in other words, that the whole is Divinely Inspired, and is considered by Christ as the Word of God?

The Veracity of Genesis is further shown by the reference Christ makes to several of the important figures of the story—Noah, Lot, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The Higher Critics cannot say how far these were actual historical characters; some even think that they had no actual existence whatever, but are simply mythical heroes. Others admit that they did exist, but that we can have no reliable *data* of their lives, a modification of that view being that we have traditions of more or less value concerning these men incorporated in the Book of Genesis; but when it is remembered that the writing is held to be so many centuries after the events, it will be seen how much value can be attached to the tradition. The allusions which Christ makes to these men plainly show that they were not shadowy, but real, personages, who passed across the stage of human life, and played their part in the world's history. No one can doubt that Christ, in speaking of these men, does not simply refer to them as men of a traditional age, concerning whom stray impressions had floated down the stream of Time, but He speaks of them as they are set forth in the pages of Genesis; and in that light His hearers understood Him.

In the case of Noah, it is that very event which seems so wonderful—the miraculous Deluge—to which He gives prominence. Of course, all primitive peoples have traditions of a deluge, and so, say the Critics, we have here the Jewish tradition. Yes; but it is far more than a tradition. There is generally something vague and hazy about traditions and myths, and, when they enter into details, there is sure to be a lack of sobriety of tone and precision of statement, and not unfrequently contradiction

and absurdity. But this account of the Flood is a simple detailed narrative, marked by clearness, conciseness, and cogency. It is utterly different in conception and treatment from all the other traditions of the Deluge. Take, for instance, the Greek tradition. Deucalion and Pyrrha are the only two mortals who are saved from the Flood. They inquire at the oracle how the race of man is to be restored; the goddess tells them to cover their heads, and throw the bones of their mother behind them. Understanding that Mother Earth is meant, that the stones represent the bones, they throw stones behind them, and those which Deucalion throws become men, while those that his wife throws become women.

If the Jews had been left to form their own traditions, they would have fared no better than other nations. We can see evidence of this in the tradition of the Talmud, even where they had Scripture history as a basis. For instance, to give a brief example: 'There was a certain coat of skins which God made for Adam; when Adam died this coat became the possession of Enoch; from him it descended to Methuselah, his son; Methuselah gave it to Noah, who took it with him into the ark. And when the people left the ark Ham stole this coat and hid it from his brothers, giving it secretly thereafter to his son Cush. Cush kept it hidden for many years, until out of his great love he gave it to Nimrod, the child of his old age. When Nimrod was twenty years of age he put on this coat, and it gave him strength and might—might as a hunter in the fields, and as a warrior in the subjection of his enemies and opponents. And his wars and undertakings prospered until he became king over all the earth.



Here we can easily see the underlying Biblical facts, but how puerile and unworthy are the human additions! In the narrative of the Deluge, as in the creation story, the Critics see two distinct and opposing accounts, in view of which they cannot hold the historical veracity of either; but our Lord evidently assumes that there is one clear, trustworthy account, and treats it as reliable and indubitable history.

So in the story of Lot it is that very portion which some of the critics would treat as mythical, merely because miraculous, the overthrow of the cities of the plain, which Christ points to as historical evidence of Divine judgment, to be used as illustrating the final judgment.

The allusions to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are less definite, or, rather, the allusions are not made to definite circumstances in their times; the men themselves are definitely enough indicated. One significant incident, however, in the life of Abraham is noted in the words, 'Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it, and was glad.' By the way, the expression 'your father Abraham' clearly implies the historical and actual existence of Abraham as the progenitor of the Hebrew race. The scene on Mount Moriah rises to one's mind as we read this statement of Christ's. We see the venerable patriarch, in obedience to the command of God, laying his darling on the altar, raising his hand to plunge the fatal knife into the heart of him in whom the promises of God seemed to centre. Suddenly the voice of God is heard, the hand of His servant is stayed, and this majestic act of imperial faith, which some have dared to call 'Abraham's mistake,' is rewarded by the glorious promise of a coming Messiah. *Then*, if ever, Abraham saw Christ's day. How much he

saw we cannot tell; it is possible that in the figurative resurrection of his son he caught a glimpse of the real resurrection of the Coming One. At any rate, through the lens of the promise he could look and see something of the fortunes of his great Seed in whom all the promises were to be fulfilled, and so vivid does faith make the vision that as he sees he rejoices.

The interpretation which Christ thus gives of this incident emphasizes another truth which the Critics are apt to ignore or minimize—the conscious Messianic element. Some of them admit the presence of this element, but to a large extent deny that the Old Testament characters had any intelligent foreview of the Coming One, after-events only unfolding the Messianic truth wrapped up in the histories. We admit that in many cases foreshadowings of the Messiah appear which might well be unknown to those immediately concerned; predictions are given concerning Christ which are far from intelligible to the immediate recipients; but at the same time we believe that in many cases Old Testament saints had a distinct view of the Coming Christ, and so Christ can say of Abraham, ‘He saw My day, and was GLAD.’

I need not in detail dwell upon the other instances where the quotations of Christ establish a real historical narrative. I only remind you that three great incidents in the life of Moses are verified by Christ—all three belong to the class which the higher critics repudiate, the miraculous—viz., the manifestation of Jehovah in the burning bush; the healing of the serpent-bitten people through looking to the uplifted brazen serpent, and the feeding of the millions by the God-given manna.

From the life of David we have one interesting scene—his visit to the priest of Nob, where, to satisfy the hunger of himself and followers, the consecrated shewbread was given. The life of David is considered by the Critics to be largely of a legendary character. The thrilling episode of the slaying of Goliath is classed among the legends; all the portions wherein the finer religious and spiritual qualities of the man after God's heart are exhibited come into the same category, and we are gravely told that he was simply a rough freebooter chief, and that anything that savours of refinement, of true nobility of nature, of spirituality of character, must be considered as poetic inventions of later times. This attempt to degrade David from the lofty place which Scripture gives him is foiled by this fact, among others, that Christ thus takes one of those so-called legendary episodes and treats it as actual history.

From the life of Solomon we have the striking scene of the Queen of Sheba's visit. Although the Higher Critics will have it that the magnificence of Solomon has been greatly exaggerated by the writer of the Chronicles, that here we have to see the shadowy splendour which in the lapse of ages gathers round antique names, yet Jesus Christ gives prominence to the profound impression made upon the Queen of Sheba by the wisdom of Solomon and the splendour of his court; and elsewhere He shows that He fully endorsed the sentiments of the nation concerning Solomon which these Scriptures nourished, when He said, 'Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.'

While admitting the historic importance of the two great prophets, Elijah and Elisha, the Critics assure us that we have but legends concerning them in this book, legends

which have come to us through a medium for which much allowance must be made, for in what one of the English Critics considers a *striking* observation the great German Critic says of Elijah, 'Legend, and not history, could alone preserve the memory of his figure.' But we have seen that the Lord met the criticisms of the men of Nazareth upon His own conduct by reminding them of those great historical facts, the sending of Elijah to the widow of Zarephath to bless her in a miraculous manner, during the miraculous drought, and the miraculous healing of Naaman the leper by the prophet Elisha. These incidents are, according to the critics, among 'the wondering stories of their Divine power and their supernatural deeds which necessarily have gathered round the truly miraculous personalities of these prophets.' According to Christ, they are sober statements of wondrous fact.

Once more, the episode in the Book of Jonah which, in common with infidels of all ages, the Higher Critics reject, even Dr. Horton saying, 'We have no reason for regarding the historical part of the book as a narration of facts,' is the very portion which Christ takes up and uses with such appropriate beauty and unanswerable force as a picture of His own burial and resurrection. The repentance of the men of Nineveh is a great fact which Christ can use both as an argument and a complaint. Dr. Horton condescends to admit that Jonah might have preached in Nineveh, and that his preaching may have been very effective, but that the whole people repented he considers a preposterous exaggeration.

Looking at these various quotations and allusions, I do not see how they could serve Christ's purpose unless they embodied historical *facts*. History alone could furnish a

sound basis for His arguments. The Critics say that Christ used the Scriptures in the sense in which the Jews understood them, although some of them even hint that a critical knowledge of the Old Testament was not among the matters which He as Son of man was permitted to know. We shall have to look at this idea later on, but meanwhile we note another of the Critics' explanations. They say that Christ simply referred to these Old Testament characters and incidents as we should refer for illustration and enforcement of a theme to the characters in Shakespeare or Dante, Scott or Dickens. But surely common-sense refuses to accept that theory. We can, of course, cite the poetical and fictitious characters of these writings to illustrate and embellish a discourse, to point a moral, or adorn a tale, but we would not think of finding in these, proof of a doctrine. A writer or speaker in making such quotations will generally indicate their character, and he will certainly not place Hamlet and Pickwick on a level with Cromwell or Samuel Johnson; he will not quote as of equal historic value a passage from Dickens and a page from Macaulay. One might well illustrate the power of conscience by depicting the experience of Macbeth or Hamlet, with his 'Conscience makes cowards of us all,' or of Marmion, with his 'Doubly cursed my failing brand, A sinful heart makes feeble hand'; but in doing so the value of the citation lies in the fact that it gives the poet's own conception of conscience, and we in effect cite him, with his wide and unpartisan knowledge of human nature, as a witness to the facts of conscience. But suppose you were to endeavour to convince a man of the evil consequence of theft and murder by pointing him to the fate of Fagin or Bill Sykes, or to show the loathsomeness of hypo-



crisy by a reference to the character of Mr. Pecksniff or the Rev. Stiggins, what weight would your arguments have with those who knew these to be fictitious characters?

Now, Christ uses these Old Testament incidents, not as poetical conceptions by way of adorning His discourse, but as actual occurrences which are to be considered as specimens of God's dealings with men. He can justify a breach of the letter of the law of the Sabbath on the ground of necessity, because under compulsion of necessity the letter of the law had been broken by David, the man of God, and the priest of the Most High. He can justify His procedure, to the Nazarenes, on the ground that it is similar to the God-approved procedure of Elijah and Elisha. He can speak of the Queen of Sheba and the men of Nineveh rising up in judgment with the men of His day, to condemn them for their impenitence. Surely those who are to rise in the judgment have had an existence in time. He can illustrate the certainty of God's coming judgment by the fact, that in the days of Noah and of Lot, God had visited men in judgment for their sins. He can arouse in His hearers a sense of terror because of the coming judgment, and a desire to escape it, by a consideration of the doom of those who neglected the ancient warnings and the deliverance of those who believed God.

On one occasion Huxley, in dealing with those who deny the historic reality of the Biblical account of the Flood, and yet believe in the authority of the Lord Jesus, used this very argument, and very cogently argued that Christ's warnings of a judgment, founded upon another judgment that had no reality, could have no force whatever. It is true he did not accept Christ as an authority, but only showed that those

who do accept Christ as an authority are bound to accept the Biblical account of the Flood.

For once I agree with Professor Huxley.

Many consider religion itself, and especially the doctrine of a coming judgment, as a poetical dream, the mirage of a disordered imagination; and if we admit to them that Christ proves and enforces the truth of that judgment, by appeals to mythical incidents and personages, *poetical* personages, *fictitious* personages, will they not be rightly confirmed in their fancies, and with some show of justice be encouraged to treat the solemn truth as the baseless fabric of a vision? But if they see that Christ shows that God will punish sin because He has always shown Himself opposed to sin, and has frequently visited it in direst judgment, they will be brought face to face with the question, What wilt thou say when God shall punish thee?

As I have dwelt somewhat fully upon the first point, I must very briefly treat of the second, viz., *Christ's testimony to the Origin of the Jewish Institutions*. The position of Wellhausen and his follower Robertson-Smith with regard to these institutions is that they originated in later times, some of them, indeed, after the Exile. Driver and Horton, in order to meet the orthodox argument that books of confessedly pre-Exilic date contain allusions to these institutions, proving them and the books which record their origin to be of a much earlier date, say that the institutions themselves might be of ancient origin, but that the reference in the earlier books is not to these institutions as described and developed in the Pentateuch, but to the more rudimentary form in which they had previously existed. I think we shall see that Christ not only refers to the existence of these

institutions, but traces them back to Moses, just as they are ascribed to his legislation in the Pentateuch.

In John vii. 22 Jesus says, 'Moses hath given you circumcision; (not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers;) and on the Sabbath ye circumcise a man.' Here there is a direct reference to Lev. xii., where Moses enjoins the Rite of Circumcision, and prescribes its performance on the eighth day; and so if that eighth day fell on a Sabbath, the law of Moses required that the rite should be performed, although its performance might seem to be a breach of the law of the Sabbath. This is not simply the rite of Circumcision, but Circumcision with all the attendant details enjoined in the law. But, then, mark that pregnant parenthesis 'not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers.' True, Moses commanded it, gave it as an institution to the nation as part of the great ceremonial law; but that was not the original institution, and so he points them back to the patriarchal origin in the time of Abraham, as recorded in the Book of Genesis. What fine discrimination, what absolute fidelity to truth, does Christ show! Verily, when there was occasion for it, He could use the true critical faculty. Incidentally, too, there is here a hint of the Mosaic authorship of the Book of Genesis, for in the sense that Moses wrote that book, and so *recorded* and transmitted the actual origin of the institution, he could be said to give them circumcision.

I need not touch upon the question of the Sabbath further than to say that it is manifest from the remarks of Christ about it, and His acceptance of the statements of the Jews, that He and they alike considered the Sabbath to be of Divine origin and enjoined by Divine authority, as indicated in the creation account in Genesis and the

promulgation of the law in Exodus, and so traceable to Moses.

Again, in Matt. xxii. the Sadducees speak of the Levirate Law., the custom established by Moses, in Deut. xxv., of the marriage of a man with his dead brother's widow, and though Christ Himself does not discuss the question, He accepts their statement, and so indirectly authorizes the assertion that this institution was also of Mosaic origin.

On that occasion of which we have already spoken, when Christ speaks of the origin of Marriage, the Pharisees say, 'Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement and to put her away?' They allude to Deut. xxiv., where this practice of Divorce is authorized by Moses. Christ does not deny that Moses did thus legislate, but He says, admitting the fact, 'Moses, because of the hardness of your heart, suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so.' How easy it would have been for Christ, had He adopted the higher critical position, to have said, 'You are quite mistaken in attributing the law of divorce to Moses. That appears in the Book of Deuteronomy, which was written eight hundred years after the time of Moses by some priest in the time of Josiah, who passed it off upon the young king as the work of Moses, but it is certainly not of Mosaic authority.'

On two occasions we have found Christ speaking of the institution in connection with the cleansing of leprosy—what is known as the Law of the leper's cleansing, or the Law of Leprosy. He distinctly attributes that to Moses, bidding the cleansed one show himself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded. This law is recorded in Lev. xiv., and is thus rightly ascribed to Moses, the

details of the examination by the priest and of the sacrifices by the cleansed one, being given. According to the Critics, this chapter, like the greater part of Leviticus, is not the work of Moses, but of that celebrated author named P, who flourished in or after the time of the Exile, and this Book of Leviticus is called the *priestly code*, being the guide-book for the priests of the second temple, the name of Moses simply being used as a literary device, to give authority to Mr. P's effusions.

Once more we notice that Christ attributes the Law in its entirety to Moses. He frequently alludes to the law, and quotes certain commandments without directly mentioning the name of Moses, but on one occasion He said, 'Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother'; on another occasion He said, 'Did not Moses give you the law?' and yet again He said, 'The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe,' evidently meaning that they were the official expounders of the law which Moses gave; and putting the three passages together it is clear that He ascribes not simply the Ten Commandments, but the whole law, moral and ceremonial, to Moses—in short, the law as recorded in the Pentateuch.

The Critics, you know, hold that scarcely any of the numerous Laws and Institutions can be traced to Moses, some holding that almost only the Ten Commandments, in a very simple form, were given by him. The various laws and ordinances were promulgated by the various inspired authors as the occasion arose, and, to give them authority among the people, were attributed to Moses. Strange people who could be so easily deluded, strange teachers who,



claiming to be inspired, could be guilty of such deception, strange inspiration that could allow and authorize it! That may be a very learned, a very profound view, but the 'sweet simplicity' with which the Master accepts the Mosaic origin of these laws and institutions is, I venture to think, characterized by greater reverence and by more common-sense. The view of the Critics is certainly in another sense a *critical* view.

Dr. Horton endeavours to save the credit of the writers who thus sheltered themselves under the great name of Moses, by asserting that the germ of the law was given to Moses, and that all the after-laws were but the development of that germ, the elaboration of the great idea which had entered his consciousness, so that men writing seven or eight centuries after Moses, giving expression to laws suitable for the times, could consistently represent these laws as given by Moses, inasmuch as they had been evolved from the germinal law which Moses gave. One wonders if any man can satisfy himself with such a representation of the case.

Another article of the Critics' creed is that the Law in its present form is in date and development later than the prophetic writings. Much of the work of the prophets they declare to have been antagonistic to the Law, but, on the other hand, much of the Law, the more spiritual part of it especially, is the outcome of prophetic influence. The Book of Deuteronomy, for instance, is the work of a prophetic writer, and as to the rest of the Hexateuch there are three leading strata. There is the work of our friend P, who is a priestly writer, and gives prominence to questions of law and ritual, especially magnifying the priestly office; and there is the work of J, who is a prophetic writer,

and gives prominence to the moral and spiritual elements: and there is E who is also a prophetic writer but differs from J in the name he gives to God. So the Books of Samuel and Kings are mainly by prophetic writers, but Chronicles is by a priestly author, and as a consequence there is throughout a glorification of priestly privileges.

Now, I think we can find a word of Christ's which goes far to shatter the whole of this complicated theory. When the lawyer asked Him, 'Which is the great commandment in the law?' He answered, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment, and the second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' The first quotation is from Deuteronomy, and so, the Critics would say, represents the prophetic teaching in the age of Josiah. The second is from the priestly code, and we might be inclined to say, speaking after the critical fashion, it represents the conclusion of the priestly party in the days of the Exile; but this particular portion, according to the critical analysis, is not the work of P, with whose work it is incorporated, but the work of P 2, as the German critics call him, or H, as Driver prefers to designate him. Whatever initial is assigned him, the writer is a priestly writer with whom Ezekiel has great affinities, and so we may presume that H is a sort of combination of prophet and priest, hence we have this moral sentiment, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Now, mark how sublimely Christ ignores all this rubbish, and asserts the true principle of connection and continuity when He says, 'On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.'

Thus, in accordance with the form of the Old Testament as we have received it, He gives the priority to the law, and asserts that the spirit expressed in this grand summary is the essence of all law and prophecy. The Law in all its details never lost sight of this great idea, never fell below it; Prophecy in its highest flights, in its most spiritual expositions, never rose above it. Yea, even the Gospel itself, in its most spiritual and far-reaching requirements, does not transcend it. This lofty summary, giving the ideal set before men throughout the whole of the old dispensation, is the ideal which Christ kept before Himself and gloriously realized; it is the ideal to which the Gospel now summons in this dispensation. The spirit which the Gospel imparts enables us now in a measure to approximate towards that ideal, and when the Gospel conducts us to the goal and we take our place in the glory, we shall not have exceeded, but simply realized, that ideal. We shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is, and in being like Him we shall be, as He was, in perfect harmony with the essence of the eternal law of righteousness, our perfection will culminate in this supreme love for God and our fellows.

These two great commands thus express God's great basal Law for the universe of being, and in the light of Christ's majestic statement, 'On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets,' the theories of the Higher Critics melt away like snow before the sun shining in its strength.

## — LECTURE IV.

CHRIST'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT DISPROVING THE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM, (3) AS TO THE AUTHORSHIP OF PARTICULAR BOOKS.

IN our last lecture we saw that Christ's testimony establishes, in opposition to the Higher Criticism, the historical veracity and accuracy of the Old Testament, and the Mosaic origin of some of the most important of the Jewish institutions; we now consider the bearing of that testimony upon the question of the *Authorship* of particular books.

This question of authorship is one upon which, *per se*, we can within certain limits have an open mind. Where a book does not claim to be written by a particular writer, and external evidence goes to show that it is, we are at liberty to balance the external and internal evidence. If there is nothing in the book itself which would make the traditional authorship impossible or unlikely, we can freely accept such traditional evidence. On the other hand, if it is clear from the book itself that it could not be the work of the supposed author, we may disregard the tradition as to the particular name, though it might still have great weight as to the time when the book was composed. If, however, we find our Lord or His Apostles attributing any

book to a certain author, the question with regard to that one is for us settled; it is no longer a matter of tradition, but of *authority*. Now, it must be admitted that Christ does not often directly quote Scripture passages with the author's name attached, His Apostles do so more frequently; but this arose largely from the fact that He considered the whole Old Testament as the Word of God, and is generally content to quote it as the Word of God without any allusion to the human medium, since it was more important to show that *God* said a certain thing than that He said it *through* a particular man. Thus the silence of Christ regarding the authorship of the majority of the books is no evidence *against* that authorship, seeing that He endorsed the Jewish opinion with regard to the whole; while the few instances in which He did speak of the human author are all the more significant.

1. *He distinctly assigns the Pentateuch to Moses.* The passages alluded to in our last as establishing the Mosaic origin of certain institutions may be taken as proving also the Mosaic *authorship* of the books in which such origin is recorded. For the Jews never separated between the *Legislation* of Moses and the *writings* of Moses. The latter embodied the former, and Christ by the way in which He makes His allusions endorses that view. In that passage (Mark vii. 10, 11), 'Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother let him die the death,' the first quotation is directly from the Commandments. Some of the critics might say Moses did no doubt receive the Ten Commandments as a revelation from God (although some of them would not admit as much as that), and Christ could refer to these without



endorsing the Mosaic authorship of the portion wherein they occur; but we note that originally the Commandments were spoken by God, and the expression 'Moses said' means more than that God spake these Commandments to Moses: it manifestly refers to the *Mosaic record* of what God said. Further, Christ goes on to quote as part of what 'Moses said,' 'He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death' (Exod. xxi. 17), so that He does something more than simply allude to the commands as given to Moses. According to the critical analysis, Exod. xx. 1-21, containing the Commandments, is the work of E; but from ch. xx. 22. to ch. xxiii., of which of course, ch. xxi. 17 is part, is by J; whereas Christ attributes both portions to Moses.

In the discussion with the Sadducees, as reported in Mark xii. 26, Christ says, 'Have ye not read in the book of Moses, in the place concerning the bush, how God spake unto him, saying,' etc. This particular portion of Exodus is assigned by the critics to E, but Christ here affirms that the whole book is the work of Moses—indeed, by that expression He probably means the Pentateuch, but undoubtedly the whole of Exodus—and that He does not simply mean the book which bears Moses' name is evident by the additional statement in Luke, '*Moses showed* in the place concerning the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.'

Not to speak again of the passages with which we have already dealt about Circumcision, Divorce, and the giving of the Law, all of which incidentally indicate the Mosaic authorship; I note the words which Christ in His parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus puts into the mouth of Abraham,

‘They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them,’ and, ‘If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.’ Now, manifestly, this means more than simply ‘they have the law as given by Moses,’ but they *have Moses*, and they could only have him in the sense of having his *writings*, and the only writings which could be considered his are, clearly, the five books which went by his name; and the only way in which they could hear Moses was by reading or hearing the words *written* by him, as in a similar way alone could they hear the prophets.

So in John v. Christ says to the leaders of the people, ‘If ye believed Moses ye would believe Me; for he *wrote of Me*. But if ye believe not his *writings*, how shall ye believe My *words*?’ Here the contrast is sharply drawn between what Christ *said* and what Moses *wrote*. Christ did not *write*; He *spoke*. Moses, as far as they were concerned, did not *speak*, but he *wrote*. So that it is not a question of any traditional utterance of Moses—not even of his utterances as recorded by other authors—but of his *writings*, the Pentateuch, as they fully understood. These men revered Moses not merely as a writer, as a great name, but as the founder of their nation, the giver of their law, the human author of their religious life, the man who had been favoured with the grandest manifestations of God. Witness their constant appeals to him, and their proud boast, ‘*We know that God spoke to Moses.*’ Having such reverence for the man, they set the highest store by his writings, which they rightly considered as the expression of God’s will to them through His honoured servant; and Christ, *knowing* all that, does not merely

endorse their opinion, but actually commends them for thinking so highly of these writings, and shows that He shares their opinion of their value, giving as a special reason for setting value upon them, 'He wrote of Me.'

If, as Dr. Horton says, He meant to condemn them for making too much of these Scriptures, would it not have been a good argument for Him to have used, 'You are so much taken up with these Scriptures which you value so highly that you will not come to me, and, after all, they are not so valuable as you suppose. You revere them because you think they are the writings of Moses, but they were really written by various scribes some 500 years ago, who used the name of Moses to win authority among the people. There may indeed be contained in them some tradition more or less true concerning Moses—it is just possible that the Ten Commandments were originally given to him, though not exactly as they are recorded—but the books which you so much esteem, because you think they are written by Moses, are really not his work at all'? If the Pentateuch is composed in so many different styles as the Critics tell us, if they can so easily detect and separate the work of P, J, E, and D, to say nothing of the subdivisions of these 'mains,' surely it would have been easy for Christ to point out convincingly these divergences to these men who understood Hebrew much better than the Critics, since it was their mother-tongue. Pardon the extravagant supposition which would represent Christ as talking after such a fashion; but since we feel how utterly foreign such a speech is to the whole tenor of His talk concerning the Bible, we must conclude that theories which make such a supposition possible are diametrically opposed to the testimony of our Lord.

So far from hinting anything of the sort, He affirms that these men are right in considering Moses the author of the Pentateuch. He founds Himself upon these writings, appeals for acceptance of His own teaching because of the testimony which Moses bears to Him, and gives to all who accept Him as the Christ, an additional, and the most precious, reason for holding in highest esteem the writings of Moses in the assurance that they do thus testify of HIMSELF.

To the same purport are those other passages: 'Beginning from Moses and from all the Prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself.' The books of Moses, standing as they did at the beginning of the Jewish Canon, and being reckoned by them as first in importance, form the starting-point of Christ's luminous exposition of Christological doctrine; and so thoroughly does Christ accept the Jewish opinion of the authorship that He can thus identify Moses with the books which bear his name. 'All things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me.' Again, it is necessarily the Pentateuch which He mentions under its Jewish name, the law, the *Torah* of Moses. It is not the law as promulgated by Moses, but the law as *written*—the things 'which are written' in the *Torah*—manifestly going far beyond the Decalogue, and including all the typical history, all the Christ-shadowing ceremonial, and all the direct prophetic utterances, the 'things . . . written . . . concerning Me.'

2. The way in which Christ in this last passage speaks of the *Psalms* ought to be conclusive as to the Inspiration and Authority of the *Book of Psalms* as a whole. We have,

however, but one direct testimony of His to the authorship of a particular psalm, which we may now consider.

There is nothing more unsatisfactory about the Higher Criticism than its treatment of the Psalter. This book, which for so many ages has been the companion of God's people, who have ever considered it as reflecting so much of the Divine mind, while voicing the most sacred feelings of devout souls, has been cast into the crucible of criticism; and if the Critics are to have their will, they will reduce it to something very different from what it has hitherto been deemed.

Of the 150 Psalms contained in the Book or five books, for, like the Torah of Moses, the Psalter is a Pentateuch, 73 are ascribed, in the titles, to David, 12 to Asaph, 10 to the Sons of Korah, 2 to Solomon, 1 to Moses, 1 to Heman, 1 to Ethan, and 50 are anonymous. So that while the book is often familiarly spoken of as the Psalms of David, orthodoxy has never considered that they were all written by him; but the majority being by David, and good reason being found for ascribing others to Him, our late beloved President was fully warranted in calling His exposition of the whole book, that *magnum opus* of his, '*The Treasury of David.*' It might indeed be questioned whether the phrases 'of' or 'to' the Sons of Korah, and Asaph, might not be taken as dedicated to them, while David himself was the composer. However, the mere fact that, on the face of it, we have such a variety of authors in the Psalter, is enough to show that in itself it is a matter of comparative indifference by whom the Psalms were written, so long as we believe them to be Inspired of God.

The Higher Critics, however, seem to start with the assumption that all old ideas are to be rejected, and especially the



opinion that credits David with the authorship of so many Psalms. They, of course, discard all the titles as imaginary inventions of later ages, although the most careful research has not been able to trace the historical origin of these titles to a later time than the professed date of the Psalms. However, to them the titles mean nothing, and at once they cast them away, and profess to find in the particular Psalms clear indications that the titles could not possibly be correct; least of all, those with regard to David. This having been done, they postdate all. Many of them are assigned to the time of the Maccabees (especially by Dr. Cheyne), some to the Exile, a few before or after it; and we are gravely told that Psalm xviii. is the oldest, and belongs to the time of Josiah. It is passing strange that the critics are so prone to date all, or nearly all, the Old Testament Scriptures to the period after the Exile—the time of Israel's decrepitude, while the golden age of the nation's history is left barren of literature.

'What about David?' you may say. As to poor David, although such an advanced critic as Ewald left him fourteen, Canon Driver cannot fix upon any one as being unmistakably by David, and after see-sawing and balancing probabilities, he brings in, on the whole, a Scotch verdict of '*Not proven*;' and adds the curious statement, 'It is possible that Ewald's list of Davidic Psalms is too large, but it is not clear that none of the Psalms contained in it are of David's composition.' While thus Driver cannot be sure that David can be credited with any, Dr. Cheyne is sure that he is the author of none. So that, like the Egyptians in the Red Sea, the Psalms of David have gone down under the proud waters of the Higher Criticism, and 'not one of them is left.'

Now, again, in the New Testament we find a break-water raised against the advancing tide of irresponsible and arbitrary criticism. The Apostles, taught by the Lord, attribute several of the Psalms to David, and plainly indicate that they accept the current Jewish ideas as to the authorship of the whole, and in the one noteworthy instance to which I alluded at the beginning of this somewhat digressive section, we find Christ Himself asserting the Davidic authorship of Psalm cx. To the Scribes and Pharisees He puts the question, 'What think ye of Christ? whose Son is He? They rightly and readily answer, 'David's.' 'How, then,' says Christ, 'doth David in the Spirit call Him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on My right hand till I put thine enemies underneath thy feet?' Surely we may say that in unmistakable terms He asserts that David is the author of Psalm cx. ,No,' says Driver, 'though it may be ancient, it can hardly have been composed by David; if read without *præjudicium* it produces the irresistible impression of having been written not by a king [mark how the critic contradicts the Christ] with reference to an invisible spiritual Being standing above him as his superior, but by a prophet with reference to *the theocratic king*.' 'It may be presumed to be pre-Exilic.' 'Not quite so fast, Mr. Driver,' says Dr. Cheyne; quite true, it certainly could not have been written by David, but as little could it be pre-Exilic; it was written in the time of the Maccabees, is indeed in the fullest sense a glorification of Simon the Maccabee—it is an encomium upon Simon in celebration of his victory, May, 142 B.C., and Simon himself is the king-priest after the order of Melchizedek.

Can we suppose that a Psalm written little more than a century before Christ could by His time be generally assigned to David without challenge? As well imagine that Gray's Elegy, written about a hundred and fifty years ago, could be assigned to the time of the Saxon Heptarchy. Dr. Cheyne, when quoting the arguments by which the Davidic authorship is maintained, says, 'Believe this who can!' With greater reason may we say, in reference to his contention for the Maccabæan authorship, 'Believe this who can!' Was not Canon Liddon justified in saying, in reference to this theory: 'Supposing it to be an ascertained result of critical inquiry that Psalm cx. belongs to the age of Simon Maccabæus, and, indeed, refers to him, it is singular that our Lord's appeal to it should have passed unchallenged; would not at least some one scribe more learned than the rest have exclaimed, "David doth not call Messiah Lord in the verse Thou quotest; the Psalm speaks of Simon, whom our fathers' grandsires saw as boys"?'

In reference to the statement of Christ, Dr. Driver says, 'His object, it is evident, is not to instruct them on the *authorship* of the Psalm, but to argue from its *contents*; and though He assumes the Davidic authorship accepted generally at the time, yet the cogency of His argument is unimpaired so long as it is recognised that the Psalm is a Messianic one, and that the august language used in it of the Messiah is not compatible with the position of one who was a *mere* human son of David.' Is that so? Is it not rather the fact that the whole argument hinges upon the assumed fact that David wrote the words? The problem which these teachers could not solve was, How could the

Messiah be at once David's son and David's Lord? Unless it is David who calls Him Lord, the difficulty does not arise. Suppose that some unknown prophet or priest spake thus of Simon the Maccabee, 'Jehovah said unto my Lord,' or even if a pre-Exilic prophet uttered the words concerning any king of Judah, there is still no difficulty, even if the personage intended be considered as typical of Christ. But 'how doth *David* call Him Lord?' there is the crucial point, there is the paradox, which can only be understood in the light of Christ's Divine and human natures. Christ held that it was David who wrote the words, and Christ knew His ground; He was no sophist; He would take no base advantage of the ignorance of His uncritical hearers, and we accept His testimony, and believe that the author of this grand Messianic Psalm was none other than the royal bard, the sweet singer of Israel; and when the critics' theory is thus so utterly shattered with regard to this Psalm, we reckon it equally worthless with regard to the other Psalms of David.

3. According to the old tradition, the prophet *Isaiah* was sawn asunder; of the truth of the tradition we cannot be sure, but we know that one of the earliest feats of the Higher Criticism was to perform the like operation upon his prophecy. So much is the theory of a divided prophecy gaining ground, that no one must make any pretension to scholarship if he hesitates to accept the double authorship of Isaiah. From ch. xl. to the close was written, we are told with tiresome iteration, not by Isaiah, but by a prophet of the Exile—the *Great Unknown*. By the way, it is remarkable how many *unknown* great men flourished among the Jews, and remained unknown to their posterity, until, in

these enterprising days, the Higher Critics arose and discovered them, brought them into light *with the exception of their names*. How wondrously modest, how self-effacing, these writers had been! and how strangely unmindful of their best men had the people been! True, we know they did not always receive the God-sent messengers; they killed the prophets, and stoned them that were sent unto them. But *killing* a man is a different thing from *ignoring* a man. You cannot well put a man to death without recognising the fact that he had existence, and one sure way of remembering a man is to kill him. But the very men who were despised, maltreated, and murdered were by a later age honoured and held in remembrance; they built the sepulchres of the prophets and garnished the tombs of the righteous. Surely these monuments were erected for men who had had a local habitation and a name, whereas, according to the Higher Critics, we might suppose that the builders of the memorials knew nothing of the men whose memory they sought to perpetuate.

Turning to the New Testament, we find many allusions to Isaiah, but we confine ourselves to the few made by Christ Himself. In Matt. xiii. He quotes from Isa. vi., 'Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand,' etc., and in Matt. xv. he quotes from ch. xxix., 'This people draweth nigh unto Me with their mouth,' etc. In both cases He assigns the words to Isaiah. He does not particularly use Isaiah's name in reference to the second portion of the prophecy, unless, indeed, as seems likely, the last-mentioned passage is also an allusion to ch. lviii. But we have the equivalent of such a citation in the incident at Nazareth, where in the synagogue there was handed to Him 'the roll



of the prophet Isaiah,' and as the Book of Isaiah He accepted it, and, opening it, found the place—still in the Book of Isaiah—where it was written, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me' (ch. lxi.), a quotation from the so-called second Isaiah. But Christ gives no hint that the portion which He expounds is by a different author; He accepts it as the Book of Isaiah, reads it as the Book of Isaiah, and is as utterly unconscious of any divided authorship as the most unsophisticated Christian can be. When He quotes the other passages He is dealing with the self-same book, and we are warranted in believing that He held it to be one and indivisible. Let us remember that the idea of a second Isaiah grew out of the rationalistic view of prophecy, and is not the offspring of devout Christian exegesis.

4. There is one other book referred to its author by Christ—namely, that of *Daniel*. According to Driver, followed by Horton, the date of the Book of Daniel is fixed at 168 or 167 B.C. Cheyne makes it some twenty years later, and of course Daniel, who flourished some four hundred years before that, could not have been the author of it. No doubt the same reason which led to the invention of a post-Exilic Isaiah—viz., to get rid of the supernatural prophetic element—led originally to the assigning of such a late date to the Book of Daniel. His detailed predictions of the course of the Persian and Grecian empires are to be looked upon as history written after the event and thrown into the form of antecedent prophecy. Christ says, 'When ye see the abomination of desolation which was spoken of by *Daniel* the prophet standing in the holy place'; and to show that He is not alluding to a spoken prophecy, but to the written prediction, which we can still read in the Book

of Daniel, He adds, 'Let him that *readeth* understand.' So that undoubtedly He considered Daniel as the writer of the book, and again we can with a very light heart set aside the conclusions of the Critics, and say, 'Let our Lord be true, and every man a liar.'

The Critics are constantly telling us that by adopting their theories we can better understand the Old Testament. Now, if that is so, why—since Christ was so anxious to expound the Scriptures to His disciples and to the people generally—did He not give them such critical information? He used the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, and constantly spoke of them under these accepted titles; why did He not plainly show the people that the Law was not, as they supposed, the Torah of Moses; that the prophetic writings were not, as they supposed, the work of the prophets; and that the Psalms, the Kethubim, the Hagio-grapha, the sacred writings, were very different from what they were generally thought to be? The answer of the Critics is twofold—first, that Christ was not commissioned to give any information on critical matters; that He had, perhaps, no knowledge of such matters, as they lay outside the sphere of His Messianic work. Practically they adopt the questionable doctrine of the *Kenōsis*, the *self-emptying* of the Divine Son. Now, we meet this with a direct negative. That Christ in some sense emptied Himself is stated in that classical passage, Phil. ii. 7; but the emptying we believe, from the context, to be the laying aside of His manifested glory as the Divine One. The emptying is manifested in the assumption of the *form of a servant* by Him who was in the *form of God*. But we cannot understand the expression to mean that Christ divested Himself of His

Divine attributes. What are the Divine attributes? Are they not the essential qualities of the Divine nature? Can anyone whose nature is Divine be without the attributes of Divinity? Can anyone who does not possess Divine attributes claim to be Divine? For Christ to have emptied Himself of the Divine attributes would have been to undeify Himself; would have been not merely a veiling of His glory in human form and being made in the likeness of man, but a becoming man so as to be *nothing more than man*. If Christ had no Divine qualities, how could He be other than a man? The mystery of the union between the Divine and human in the God-man we do not attempt to explain, as we are not competent to conceive it; but it is a matter of revelation that Christ as man ceased not to be God, and faith, without cavilling, reverently accepts the revelation. Were the doctrine of the *Kenōsis* true in the German sense, and did we believe that Christ divested Himself of His Divine attributes, the Incarnation would not be the forming a link between God and man; and the hope, resting upon the Atonement of the incarnate Son of God, of men rising to union with God, would be without foundation.

But even did we grant the *Kenōsis*, that would not very materially help the Critics, for in the Gospels we are face to face with this other great fact, that Christ was anointed by the Spirit of God for His ministry, and had that *Spirit given to Him without measure*. And on the very lowest supposition, it was essential that He should know all that was necessary for the carrying out of His great work. We have seen how He asserted the historic veracity and accuracy of the Old Testament, how He attributed the law and other

institutions to Moses, and how He ascribed certain books to particular authors. Now, admitting, for the sake of argument, that it was not needful that He should give any information on these critical questions of Historical Veracity, Origin of Institutions, or Authorship, yet, surely, it was needful that He should be prevented from making erroneous allusions to them; from stating explicitly what was not true; and from founding important arguments upon suppositions which were destined to be overthrown by German and British Critics in the nineteenth century! No, no! the supposition of Christ's ignorance upon such matters cannot for a moment be entertained. The only passage that seems to hint at a limitation of His knowledge is the statement that the Son knew not the day of the Advent; it would lead us too far aside to discuss that, but it evidently means that He was not permitted then to declare that date. But as to His fulness of knowledge how explicit are the statements! 'He knew what was in man,' He could read the mysteries of the human heart like an open page: 'All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father; and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth anyone know the Father, save the Son, and He to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him.' If He so fully knew the human and Divine, the finite and the eternal, all that 'God and man is,' can we imagine that He came behind the Critics of our day in His knowledge of His own Book, the Book of which, by His Spirit, He was the author, and of which in His mediatorial capacity He was the glorious Subject? He was the Prophet more glorious than Moses, possessed of such authority that it is incumbent upon all to hear what He saith; He is God's beloved Son, concerning whom the

voice from heaven cries, 'Hear ye Him;' He was, and is, the *only wise God our Saviour*, and from the fulness of His infinite wisdom nothing in heaven, earth, or hell is hidden.

Perhaps, however, the Critics do not rely quite so much upon the argument drawn from the supposed ignorance of Christ, as upon the assumption of *Accommodation*. This is their favourite expression. Christ, in His use of the Old Testament, accommodated Himself to the prejudices of the Jews. Is there any evidence for such a position? There are two kinds of accommodation which a teacher may use. He may so accommodate his teaching to the capacity of his scholars that he may meet them on their own level, and seek to raise them gradually, keeping back more difficult truths until plainer ones have been apprehended. Such accommodation Christ did use. He sought to simplify the truth, that His disciples might the better understand it, and after all He had to say, 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.' So the Apostle fed with milk those who were not able to bear strong meat.

But there is another kind of accommodation. A teacher may lower himself to the level of his scholars' ignorance and prejudices so that he assumes they are right, and does not seek to correct their mistaken ideas, but puts all his teaching into the same mould, making it harmonize with their false fancies, lest running counter to their prejudices he should meet with their dislike. Now, a teacher who could so accommodate himself to his scholars would surely not be worthy of the name. *That is the kind of accommodation they attribute to Christ!* In the name of truth and honesty, in the name of common-sense and simplicity, to say nothing of Christianity, we repudiate the degrading sup-



position. It is hardly worth confuting, it is contradicted not only by the character of Christ, but by His whole conduct.

Dr. Horton speaks very piously of the wisdom of Christ in not thwarting the prejudices of the Jews upon such points: it would have done no good; it would have spoiled His influence; it would have frustrated the object He had in view; it would only have evoked their opposition and determined enmity. Has the man who talks in that strain forgotten the actual story of the Man of Nazareth—the real result of Christ's ministry? Did the Jews receive His accommodated teaching? Did they refrain from opposing Him? If Christ had deliberately run counter to every prejudice of the Jews, could they have treated Him worse than they did? Could they have done more than put Him to death? It seems such utter folly in the face of the Gospel narrative to talk in that strain.

Not only is there absolutely no evidence that Christ did so accommodate Himself to their prejudices, but there is abundant evidence that He did the very opposite. What was the greatest prejudice of the Jews in those days? Was it not the idea that the Messiah should be an earthly king, a mighty conqueror? How did Christ treat that prejudice? Was not His whole life a protest against it, and an exposition of the contrary doctrine? and was not His death largely owing to the fact that He did not fall in with these prejudices on that point? And to mention no other instance, we have positive evidence that on the matter of Biblical criticism and interpretation He very frequently differed from them. Read the withering comment in Matt. xxii.; see how He condemns their hypocritical conduct, their unscriptural casuistry, their unspiritual exposition.

Remember that great passage where He tells them that they make void the *Word of God* by *their tradition*. If He so deliberately, so boldly, repudiated their traditions when they clashed with the Word of God, can we suppose that if the traditional ideas concerning the composition and authorship of the Old Testament had been contrary to truth, He, the faithful and true Witness, would have scrupled to reject these traditions as well?

We are confronted with three suppositions: either Christ did not know anything about the composition and authorship of His own Bible; or, knowing, He deliberately kept back the truth, and deceived the people; or *the theories of the Higher Criticism are unfounded*. The first supposition is derogatory to His Divinity, and inconsistent with His prophetic dignity. The second is unworthy of His purity, inconsistent with His truthfulness, and destructive of His honesty. The third supposition, that the Critics are wrong, is, if I mistake not, the one that we shall all adopt; and God forbid that any other should ever find footing in this school of the prophets founded by him who so nobly and courageously stood for the defence of the Gospel, and was tutored for so many years by George Rogers and David Gracey.

NOTE. Since the above was written the Higher Critics have grown more daring and the most usual explanation now given of Christ's attitude to the Scriptures is that He was really ignorant, was 'a child of His age' &c.

## LECTURE V.

### THE APOSTLES' USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, PROVING ITS AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION.

WE now pass on to consider the quotations from the Old Testament made by the New Testament writers other than those already noticed as given by Christ Himself. Not to mention the fact that the genealogical tables given by Matthew and Luke are founded on the Old Testament, and that the song of Mary and the prophecy of Zacharias as recorded by Luke, are deeply tinged with Old Testament thought, we note in Matt. i. 22 the apt citation and application of Isaiah's prediction concerning the birth of the virgin's child, whose name was to be called Immanuel. Matthew also records the answer of the scribes to Herod concerning the place of Messiah's birth, as indicated in the prophecy of Micah. In the light of the flight into Egypt, and subsequent recall, he can read and interpret the word of Hosea, 'Out of Egypt have I called my Son'; through the sorrows of the mothers of Bethlehem he sees fresh meaning in the old lament of Jeremiah concerning Rachel weeping for her children; and in Christ's residence in Nazareth he understands how it is fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, 'He shall be called a Nazarene.'

When John the Baptist begins his ministry, he claims,

as recorded by all four Evangelists, to be the herald foretold by Isaiah. In the early ministry of Jesus in Galilee Matthew sees a fulfilment of the glowing prediction in Isa. ix. 1, 2; and at a later stage of His ministry He quotes, as fulfilled in Him, that great prophecy of the Elect Servant of Jehovah; while in the suffering life of the Lord He sees a partial realization of the sad picture given in Isa. liii. To the teaching of Christ by parables he applies the statement of Psalm lxxviii. In the entry into Jerusalem he sees the word of Zechariah accomplished, and in the purchase of the potter's field with the blood-money thrown down by the traitor, an obscure prediction is seen to glow with fresh meaning.

It will be observed that most of these quotations are given by Matthew. Mark and Luke, while recording many of the Lord's references to the Old Testament, do not often quote directly from it themselves. They both give the Baptist's reference to Isaiah, and Luke, in reporting Gabriel's announcement of the birth of John, gives his quotation from Malachi; and, in recording the purification of Mary, he gives two quotations from the ceremonial law of Moses. The reason for the prominence given to the Old Testament by Matthew is, doubtless, to be found in the fact that he wrote especially for Jews, and so took every opportunity of showing how exactly the prophecies were realized in Christ.

John gives a few additional quotations which we may briefly notice. When he gives the account of the cleansing of the temple by Christ, he mentions the fact that the disciples remembered that it was written, 'The zeal of Thine house shall eat Me up.' When calling attention to the strange unbelief of the people despite all the signs which

Jesus had performed, he finds the anticipation and explanation of it in two important passages of the prophecy of Isaiah. When he looks upon the brutal soldiers, as they dispose of the garments of the Lord, he calls to mind the Scripture which saith, 'They parted My garments among them, and upon My vesture did they cast lots'; and when he records the significant fact that the soldiers brake not the legs of his crucified Master, but pierced His side, he finds both the omission and the act delineated on the prophetic page, 'A bone of Him shall not be broken,' and 'They shall look on Him whom they pierced.'

I shall not stay to give the quotations in the Acts and the Epistles, but simply mention that there are something like two hundred direct quotations, besides about four hundred allusions, more or less direct, to Scriptural facts and incidents. These quotations are taken from nearly all parts of the book, most frequently from those portions which have been most seriously attacked by the Critics. All the more important institutions of the Old Testament are indicated, and nearly all the important characters are mentioned. The Apostles had the same Old Testament that we have, and practically they used it as we use it. Indeed, it is from them that the Church has learned how to treat the Old Testament, while they, in turn, learned the lesson from their Lord.

That these quotations establish the AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT cannot reasonably be doubted. The testimony of the Evangelists proceeds upon the same lines as that of their Lord. He, as we have seen, constantly claimed to act in accordance with Scripture, and asserted that He was the great subject of the Old Revelation. Nearly all the additional quotations given by the

Evangelists are in support of the principle afterwards distinctly formulated, that 'the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.' They, like their Lord, accepted these Scriptures as authoritative, and their hearts rejoiced as they traced in the life of Jesus the filling up of the prophetic outline. They had as sons of Israel been taught from infancy to reverence the Old Testament as an unerring guide. Believing that Jesus was the One therein depicted, they attached themselves to Him, and all their intercourse with Him served but to increase their faith in the Old Testament, and their reverence for its authority as the Word of God.

In a threefold character they witness to the inspired authority of that Word: 1. *As devout Jews* who in common with their fellow-countrymen submitted to it without questioning. 2. *As disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ*, who had had the benefit of His special instruction for three years. During that time they had seen how He studied and interpreted the Word of God, and that fact alone is sufficient to stamp their interpretations with considerable authority. 3. They witness in the character of *men who were themselves Inspired by the Spirit of Christ*, so that we are bound to receive their testimony as authoritative. The various formulæ used in introducing a quotation suggest that the appeal is made to an Unerring Authority: 'Thus *it is written*'; 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by, or *through*, the prophet'; 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord, through the prophet'; 'in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled'; 'the Scripture saith.' Putting them together, we have the revelation given *by* God, *through* the human medium, *recorded* in the Scripture,



and so constituting a *written* standard of doctrine and life, beyond which there is no appeal.

We reach another stage of the question when we come to the Acts of the Apostles. In the Gospels we see the great Founder of Christianity taking His stand upon the Scriptures, and constantly appealing to their authority, while His inspired biographers in the same way establish His claims. In the Acts of the Apostles we see His inspired disciples going forth at their Lord's command to win men to Him, and to establish His Church on earth; and in all their work they, like their Master, found themselves on the Old Testament. In preparing for their public testimony, by filling up their number to the original twelve, they are guided in their action by the Scripture, which concerning the traitor said, 'His office let another take.' When, on the day of Pentecost, Peter stands forth, as the spokesman of the Apostolic band, to explain to the puzzled Jews the wondrous phenomena they had witnessed, he at once appeals to the Scripture as an authority which he recognised equally with his hearers. The outpouring of the Spirit is the fulfilment of Joel's prophecy, and that fulfilment itself proves how truly the prophecy was inspired. He declares the *fact* of the resurrection, and he clinches the testimony by a quotation from Psalm xvi., in the exposition of which he clearly shows that it treats of the resurrection, and therefore must have been an inspired utterance. He proclaims the further fact of Christ's exaltation, and that also He shows to have been predicted in Psalm cx.

Again, when he explains to the wondering people the cause of the lame man's cure, he shows that the death, resurrection, and saving power of Jesus, had all been set forth in

the Scriptures, and strongly insists upon their absolute inspiration. He recognises the fact that the Word came *through* men: '*Moses* indeed said, A prophet shall the Lord God raise'; 'Yea, and *all* the prophets from *Samuel*, and *them that followed after*, as many as have spoken, they also told of these days.' But he also shows that *God* was the great *author* of all the prophecies: 'The things which *God* foreshowed by the mouth of all His prophets'; 'All things whereof *God* spoke by the mouth of His holy prophets which have been since the world began.' Thus, while the human element is not ignored, it is shown to be subservient to the Divine, which is specially emphasized, as that which gives importance and authority to the Scriptures, and stamps them with the seal of Infallible Inspiration.

In this brief paragraph, too, we notice how Peter practically alludes to the whole Old Testament: he has a special quotation from Genesis, the promise to Abraham; an allusion to the three great patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; quotations from Deuteronomy, with allusions to the whole work of Moses; and a reference to the whole cycle of prophetic testimony. Manifestly, to him the Word was what it is to us, an undivided whole, to any part of which he could without hesitancy turn and cite it as of Divine authority.

When brought before the Sanhedrim and asked concerning the miracle, Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, again testifies to the resurrection of the One whom they had crucified, and supports his assertion by an allusion to Psalm cxviii., 'He is the stone which was set at nought of you the builders, which was made the head of the corner.' Doubtless, some of those very men had heard the Lord's parable of the Vineyard; did they now, as Peter spoke,

remember how Jesus had lashed them with that same passage? They recognised Peter and John as having been with Jesus; did they remember seeing them with Him on that particular occasion? and did their utterances, which reflected so much of the spirit of the Master, appeal to them all the more powerfully on that account? At any rate, they were utterly unable to meet the Scriptural arguments of the Apostles except by charges and threatenings.

Dismissed from that august assembly, which represented the power, the wisdom, the glory, of the earthly Israel, the Apostles make their way to another assembly, which was far more representative of the true Israel; the company of true believers, filled with spiritual power, having the true Shekinah glory in their midst, and who, taught Divine wisdom by the Spirit of God, lift up their voices in prayer and plead for blessing, which is readily and richly given. So saturated are they with the spirit of the Scriptures that their prayer is largely a quotation and application of Psalm ii., and of this they avow the *Full Inspiration* when they say, 'Who by *the Holy Ghost* by the mouth of our father David Thy servant did say.'

Passing on to the speech in which Stephen makes his defence before the Council, we find that it is full of Scripture. It is indeed a marvellous summary of the history of Israel as given in the Old Testament, from the call of Abraham to the building of Solomon's temple; with several quotations from the prophetic books, and an allusion to the whole history of the prophets: a veritable epitome of the Bible itself, showing how well Stephen had studied it, and how thoroughly, through the teaching of the Holy Ghost, he had entered into its meaning. Yes, is it not significant

that while it is so often said that Stephen was full of the Holy Ghost, that blessed Spirit in him thus leads him, throughout his defence, to keep close to the Old Testament Scriptures? Surely that word which the Holy Ghost enabled him in his public ministry to expound, and to whose authority in these last hours he appeals, could be none other than the Word of God.

Philip, the evangelist, another man who is under the special guidance of the Holy Ghost, is brought into contact with the man of Ethiopia, who, reverencing the authority, is reading the words, of the evangelical prophet. Philip, so far from seeking to shake the man's faith in that word, approves of his treatment of it, and, beginning at the same Scripture, preaches unto him Jesus. And this is the glory of that grand old Book, which so many are disposed to esteem so lightly, that a man taught of the Spirit of God can open it at any part, and, beginning from the same Scripture, preach *Jesus*. But that would be absurd and misleading were that Word a mere human composition, were it not the Word of God, the Revelation of Jesus Christ.

When Peter, called by the providence of God to open the kingdom to the Gentiles, preaches the Gospel to the household of Cornelius, he begins by a quotation from Isaiah; outlines the life and death of Jesus; proclaims Him as Saviour, Lord, and Judge; and sums up his address in words which contained for him an almost axiomatic truth, 'To Him bear *all the prophets* witness.' And the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the hearers manifested the Divine approval; was the Divine endorsement of the Apostle's utterances. Can we imagine that blessed Spirit endorsing or approving the sentences in which men declare the uninspired or non-authoritative character of the Old Testament?

A new recruit joins the Apostolic band—the former opponent and persecutor. From his youth he had been pre-eminently proficient in the Old Testament Scriptures. Having the privilege of studying under the most famous professor, Gamaliel, he had graduated with honours, and distanced all competitors. Brought under the regal influence of the Lord Jesus, taught by the Spirit of God, he finds that, though he has to cast away much that he had formerly prized, he does not need *to cast away his Bible*. Yea, he has obtained a key which unlocks its mysteries; he finds in it fresh beauties and new meaning; he sees that all the lines of Biography and History, Law and Ritual, Doctrine and Prophecy, are *converging* lines which find their *focus* in the Christ of God; and so he gladly preaches and proves from the *Scriptures* that Jesus is the Christ. In the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, he is present during the reading of the Law and the Prophets, and has the opportunity given him of saying a word to the people. So far from condemning their attachment to the Law and the Prophets, he bases his address upon these writings; epitomizes the history from the bondage of Egypt to the reign of David, and so reaches the application in the facts of Christ's life, death, and resurrection. Besides the historical summary which he gives, he makes several distinct and important quotations from Samuel, from the second and sixteenth Psalms, from Isa. lv., and from the prophecy of Habakkuk; in several instances giving the words of the writer as the *word of God*, thus showing that the whole of the Scriptures was to Him the Word of God. The next Sabbath, when the Jews in their jealousy oppose and blaspheme, Paul and Barnabas declare that they will turn to the Gentiles, 'for so hath the

*Lord commanded us, saying.* Mark where they find the command: 'I have set thee for a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be My salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth.' So that the prophecy of Isaiah is the *commandment* of the Lord to them; could anything more clearly show the abiding authority of that Word?

When the great question of the relation of the Gentiles to the ceremonial law is discussed in the council at Jerusalem, there is never any hint by way of disparaging the inspiration of Moses, rather the opposite; and when the work of God among the Gentiles has been so graphically described by Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, James expresses the judgment of the Spirit in the matter, but he deems it necessary to fortify his position by a quotation from the Book of Amos; so that even while uttering the most solemn decisions, under the guidance of the Spirit, the Old Testament is still recognised and honoured. The conduct of the Bereans, who, when they heard the Gospel preached, 'searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so,' is recorded with approval. Of Apollos it is mentioned as a chief qualification that 'he was mighty in the Scriptures,' and although Priscilla and Aquila expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly, they did not attempt to shake his faith in those Scriptures, but after receiving from them the full knowledge of Jesus, 'he powerfully confuted the Jews, and that publicly, *showing by the Scriptures* that Jesus was the Christ.'

In Paul's address before Agrippa, he affirms that he said 'nothing but what the *prophets and Moses* did say should come,' and he appeals to the king as a believer in the prophets. So when in Rome he was interviewed by the chief of the Jews, he persuades them 'concerning Jesus, both



from *the law of Moses and the prophets*, from morning till evening,' and finds in their unbelief a fulfilment of the sixth of Isaiah.

Now, it is remarkable with regard to these quotations in the Acts, that, however varied the speakers may be, they all handle the Scriptures in the same reverential manner, and allude to them in the same tone. Do we listen to Peter and James, as representing the twelve Apostles; or Stephen and Philip, men chosen out of the body of the converts, evangelists specially endowed by the Holy Ghost; or Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles; or Apollos, the gifted Alexandrian—from all we hear the uniform testimony to the importance and authority of the Old Testament. Whence that uniformity? Dr. Baur and others are fond of appealing to the *Christian consciousness* as a more reliable authority than the written Word. Taking this, as we think, lower ground for a moment, have we not here the testimony of the *Christian consciousness* of the early Church in this matter? These men undoubtedly were in perfect harmony with all the disciples; to a large extent they had the task of moulding the thought of the Church, and we are warranted in taking them as truly representing the Church on this important subject. The *Christian consciousness* THEN unhesitatingly declared for the supremacy of Scripture; and the Christian consciousness when in a healthy condition will *always* do so. The consciousness of the Church *then* had been under special influences: not a few of its members, and nearly all its leaders, had been in direct contact with the Lord Himself; they had heard His masterly expositions of the Divine Word, and seen how He accorded it highest honour; the

Apostles had been favoured in those closing interviews with their Master with a new and blessed insight into the whole Book; and fresh from that vision, with the impress of the Master's moulding hand upon them, with His voice still sounding in their ears and His glory shining before them, they open up the Scriptures to others. If ever the Christian consciousness were worthy of trust, it must have been so then, when it echoed the Master's voice and reflected His judgment. So that if we take the Acts simply as a record of historical facts, we are face to face with the conclusion that the early Church as a whole believed in the full Inspiration and absolute Authority of the Old Testament. That is the lowest ground that can be taken, but once we have honestly taken that, we are bound to rise to higher, for that historical record itself shows us that upon the whole Church the Holy Ghost had come, and that these men, who spake in her name, were specially filled with the Spirit of inspiration. Thus the testimony we have is Inspired testimony to the Inspired Word—the testimony of the Holy Ghost in the New to the reality of the testimony borne by the Holy Ghost in the Old. We are sometimes told that Christianity at the first was not dependent upon a *book*. The early preachers, we are assured, went forth simply with a living message concerning the living Christ, and it is inferred that if we had no written Word now the Gospel might just as well be propagated by the living messenger. A simple study of the Acts of the Apostles explodes that fallacy. It is true, as we gladly admit, that prominence is given to the living message from living lips; it is also true that throughout the Gospel dispensation the Word must be preached, and God will specially honour the

proclamation of His truth by His servants. But it is *not true* that the early preachers were without a Book. They had the Old Testament, and treated it as an infallible authority, and from it, as we have seen, they were wont to preach Jesus. The great difference between them and us, and it is largely a difference of form, is that they had no written Gospel; but at the first this was not needed; they were personally familiar with the *facts* of the *Gospel narrative*, and these facts formed the staple of their sermons. They knew them so well that they did not need to have them written; they had the special illumination of the Spirit of God to keep these things in remembrance; but before that first generation of preachers had passed away, provision was made for a more permanent record, and the Gospel facts which had crystallized into narrative form were committed to writing, and became the handbook of the Gospel preachers.

So with regard to the further instruction of the Church. While the inspired Apostles were present they could reveal the mind of the Lord to His people, but soon they were guided to write their Epistles to the Churches, which took rank with the Old Testament, and, like it, were read in the assemblies, and so came to be the guide of the people in spiritual matters when the Apostles had gone home. Our missionaries when they go to foreign countries are following Apostolic example when they found their preaching on the Bible. It is true they must and do seek to present a living Christ to the people, but they are all the better able to do that through having the written Record, and surely the Word, instead of being a hindrance to them, as has been almost suggested, is their greatest help. Let a man fully consecrated, all aflame with love to Christ, thoroughly acquainted

with the Gospel message, go out to some distant heathen land and take *no Bible with him*, and what will be the result? We do not say he will have no success, but surely his success will be meagre compared with what it might have been had he taken his Bible, while any success that he may have will make it *necessary for him* to reproduce either orally or in writing, as far as he is able, the Bible which he has in his memory, subject as it then would be to all kinds of mistakes and imperfections. Soon he would find that, in order to guide aright those who were brought to the truth, he must either have the infallible Spirit in Apostolic measure or the infallible written Word.

We pass to a third stage of the subject in considering the quotations in the Epistles. In the Acts we see the preachers of the Gospel engaging in their work of winning men to Christ, making Him known to those who were strangers to Him. In the Epistles we see them instructing those who had been gathered to Christ. In their public proclamation of the Evangel we have seen them making constant use of the Old Testament, and we shall find that it is not otherwise in their instruction of believers.

Turning to the Epistle to the Romans, we note that Paul begins by the assertion that the Gospel which he preached had been before promised of God through His prophets in the Holy Scriptures—a remarkable and suggestive collocation. *God promised, through His prophets, in the Holy Scriptures, concerning His Son.* Passing by the allusions to the law and circumcision in the second chapter, we come upon that striking statement in the third, that the Jews ‘were intrusted with *the oracles of God.*’ Surely, by such a suggestive expression, he places the Old Testament upon a very high

level. He proves the Divine faithfulness from the fifty-first Psalm—‘as it is written.’ His terrible indictment against Jews and Gentiles is borne out by the testimony of Scripture, and by the one formula ‘it is written’ he introduces quotations from five different Psalms, from Proverbs, and Isaiah. He unites them all together as of equal value, and speaks of them all as ‘what the law saith.’ The righteousness of God which the Gospel proclaims ‘is witnessed by the law and the prophets.’ Justification by faith is exemplified in the case of Abraham, ‘as the Scripture *saith*,’ and is further supported by David’s words in the thirty-second Psalm, and the remainder of that fourth chapter is full of references to the history of Abraham; indeed, the whole argument proceeds upon the assumption of the Veracity, the Validity, the Authority of the record in Genesis. In the fifth chapter the fall of Adam is made the basis of an important argument, and in the seventh the nature of the law is the special topic. In the eighth chapter the forty-fourth Psalm is cited in reference to the persecution of God’s people.

The ninth chapter is full of Scripture quotations. Among the great privileges of the natural Israel he reckoned the giving of the *law* and the *promises*, and almost immediately uses the phrase, the ‘*Word of God*,’ as manifestly equivalent to the law and the promises. Point by point in his great argument on the sovereignty of God is proved from the Old Testament, the word concerning Isaac, Esau, Jacob, the treatment of Pharaoh; in the latter connection we have the peculiar expression, the ‘Scripture *saith* unto Pharaoh,’ where the Scripture is personified and regarded as the authoritative voice of God. In quoting from Hosea, he says, ‘as he *saith also* in Hosea’ several quotations from Isaiah follow,

so that in this brief discussion he refers to four of the books of Scripture—Genesis, Exodus, Hosea, and Isaiah—takes a passage from each as it suits his purpose, and rests the whole weight of the argument upon the citations. Surely this shows that to him the Scripture was *authoritative*, and that the various portions were of *equal* authority. In the tenth chapter, when treating of the proclamation of the Gospel and its rejection by the Jews, he quotes from Leviticus, from Deuteronomy three times, from Joel, from Psalms, and from Isaiah four times. Here, again, he considers the quotations as settling the point in dispute, and by thus quoting from the various books he again shows that he looked upon the Word as a unity, every part of which was worthy of equal reverence.

In the eleventh chapter he passes on to treat of the hope for Israel according to the election of grace, and once more he multiplies quotations in proof of his position, culling them from Kings, Psalms, and Isaiah. 'It is written,' 'the Scripture saith,' 'David saith'—thus he drives home his points, and feels that his arguments are unanswerable, because they are based on the infallible Word. In the twelfth and thirteenth chapters, passing from the doctrinal to the practical, he seeks to enforce moral duties, but he still rests upon the Scriptures, citing passages from Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Proverbs, Isaiah, and Amos, thus showing that the Old Testament is of authority for matters of life as well as doctrine. In the fourteenth chapter, treating of the conduct of believers towards each other, he reminds them of the solemn fact that all their actions will be tested before the judgment-seat, and he is not content to predict that judgment upon his Apostolic authority, but must needs again



appeal to the written Word, 'As I live, saith the Lord, to Me every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess to God': '*So then,*' drawing the irresistible inference from the Scripture premises—'*each one of us shall give account of himself to God.*' Thus the Old Testament has authority not only with regard to matters of doctrine and of present life, but also as to things to come.

In the fifteenth chapter, dealing especially with the subject of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, he has six different quotations from Deuteronomy, Psalms, and Isaiah, and feels that nothing more need be said when he has proved from Scripture that it was God's will that the Gospel should be preached to the Gentiles. There are several expressions in this chapter which may be noted more carefully. Applying to Christ Psa. lxi. 9, 'The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on Me,' he thus justifies the application, 'For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope.' Here the principle is laid down that the Old Testament has a special message for the men of this dispensation. It had a message for those to whom it first came, but there were in it depths of meaning which could only be fully explored under the circumstances introduced by the Gospel. It especially set forth Christ, but it was also full of teaching for those who trust in Christ. So that, so far from the Scriptures realizing their end when Christ came, and then passing away, they were to remain to the Church as an abiding source of patience, comfort, and hope. Again, he says, 'For I say' in all the plenitude of Apostolic authority 'Christ hath been made a minister of

the circumcision for the *truth* of God, that He might *confirm* the *promises* given unto the fathers, and that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy, as it is written,' etc. Thus, the great prophetic work of Christ is simply to *confirm* the promises, to maintain the truth of God, so that Jew and Gentile might alike enjoy the blessing of salvation foreshadowed in those Old Testament Scriptures—in other words, Christ's business is largely to ratify the truth and enforce the authority of the Old Testament. Note one other expression; he introduces the quotation from Ps. xviii. by the formula 'it is written,' and immediately he quotes from Deuteronomy in this wise: 'And again *He saith*, Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with His people.' Thus '*He saith*' is equivalent to '*it is written*'; the one phrase explains the other. 'All that is written' being written under the inspiration of God can be quoted as what '*He saith*,' and because He hath said it the Word is stamped with authority Divine.

Paul commenced this Epistle by claiming that the Gospel was the unfolding of the Scriptures; he closes it with a similar declaration. The Gospel is 'the mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal, but now is manifested, and by the *Scriptures* of the *prophets*, according to the commandment of the eternal God, is made known unto all the nations unto obedience of faith.' Note, this mystery is not simply made known 'according to the prophets,' but it is made known by or through 'the *Scriptures* of the prophets'; and the preaching of Paul, and the other Apostles as recorded in the Acts, and the reasoning of this Epistle, form the best commentary on these words.

The Gospel was literally made known through the

Scriptures of the prophets. These Scriptures formed the text-book, supplied the arguments, and furnished the authority which the Apostles desired, and all was according to the commandment of the eternal God. The Scriptures embodied that commandment, being themselves the outcome of it, and wherever made known enforced it.

It is natural that Romans, being more in the form of a treatise upon important doctrinal subjects, and addressed to a Church which had not had the benefit of the oral teaching of the Apostle, should contain more references to the Old Testament than some of the others written on practical matters, and dealing with the details of the Christian life; still, we find a goodly number of quotations in the Epistle to the Corinthians, besides many allusions. In the first chapter he quotes from Isaiah and Jeremiah, in each case using the phrase 'it is written.' In the second chapter the things which Isaiah declares to be beyond the ken of the human senses are shown to be the possession of believers through the revelation of the Spirit. And the mind of the Lord, concerning which Isaiah asked the question, 'Who hath known it?' is declared to be a Christian privilege for 'we have the mind of Christ.' In the third chapter Job and the Psalms are cited in confirmation of the Apostle's judgment upon the wisdom of this world. In the sixth chapter he quotes Gen. ii. 24, and, like the Master, attributes the words to God Himself, 'For the twain, *saiith He*, shall become one flesh.' In the ninth chapter he finds authority for the support of the Gospel minister, in the injunction written in the law of Moses, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn.' This he declares to have been written mainly 'for our sake.' The tenth

chapter abounds in allusions to the history of the Israelites in the wilderness, and from their conduct solemn lessons are enforced upon the Corinthians. Here we come upon a principle of interpretation which is frequently alluded to in the New Testament, viz., the typical bearing of the Old Testament history. 'These things,' says Paul, 'were types of us'; again, 'All these things happened unto them as types'; and thus it is that much of the Old Testament, which seems at first sight to have no direct message to us, nevertheless, from its typical nature, when rightly understood, has a very distinct and helpful voice. Thus, Paul never hesitates to expound and apply these typical narratives. In the fourteenth chapter a quotation from Isaiah is given as, 'In the law it is written'; this is one of several passages showing that the term 'the law' was used to designate the whole Old Testament. In the fifteenth chapter we have several quotations from the Psalms, Isaiah, Genesis, and Hosea; one of the passages from the Psalms being introduced in the familiar way, '*He saith.*'

We may not stay to notice in detail all the other passages, but just briefly note the method of quotation in the more important.

In 2 Cor. vi. 2, the passage from Isaiah, about the acceptable time, is introduced by, '*For He saith*'; and in the same chapter a combination of passages from Leviticus, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Samuel is given as spoken by the Lord—'*saith the Lord, 'saith the Lord Almighty.*'

In Galatians, a doctrinal and controversial Epistle, the Scripture is quoted very freely and forcibly. Here, again, we have the writing personified, 'The Scripture, *foreseeing* that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, *preached* the Gospel

beforehand unto Abraham.' Again, '*Howbeit the Scripture hath shut up all under sin.*' We have the function of the law stated as being that of a pedagogue to lead us to the school of Christ. We have the remarkable exposition of the typical teaching of the relation between the seed of the bond-woman and the free, between Hagar and Sarah, between Sinai and Jerusalem; and in that connection we meet the phrase, '*Howbeit what saith the Scripture, Cast out the bondmaid and her son,*' etc., words spoken by Sarah, but being recorded by Scripture, they are here quoted as the utterance of Scripture, and on account of their typical import possess the force of an authoritative command. Then we have the assertion, 'The whole law is summed up in this word, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' In this Epistle Paul teaches that much of the Old Testament really contains and proclaims the Gospel of justification by faith; that the ceremonial law, having fulfilled its function in leading to Christ, has no binding force upon Christians as to their conduct, but remains as an authentic representation of the work of Christ; that the moral law abides as the rule of life for the child of God; and that the history of the Old Testament is, because of its typical meaning, capable of manifold application to Christian doctrine, life, and work. Such conclusions could only be drawn from a belief in the Inspired Authority of the whole.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians there are some ten quotations and allusions, but not introduced by any particular formula, except in the case of the quotation from Ps. lxxviii., which is introduced by 'Wherefore He saith,' and perhaps another from Isa. lx. in the same words. In the remaining short Epistles there are several allusions, but few direct quota-

tions, and none of sufficient importance to call for additional consideration at this time.

When we come to the Epistle to the Hebrews, the authorship of which cannot with perfect confidence be assigned to Paul, although those who are most opposed to the Pauline authorship admit the Pauline character of its teaching, we find a very large number of important quotations. Like Romans, it is a doctrinal treatise, more of a treatise than an Epistle, and a magnificent exposition of the Old Testament system it is. The fact that so much of the Scriptures is quoted is proof enough of the estimate in which they were held by the writer; nearly a fourth part of it consists of direct quotations, and if we add to these the historical and other allusions, we may reckon nearly half of the Epistle as a reproduction of the Old Testament. As to the manner of quotation, we note the various passages from the Psalms in the first chapter are given as Divine utterances, '*He saith.*' In the twenty-second Psalm, as quoted in the second chapter, it is Christ who speaks, saying, 'I will declare Thy name unto My brethren.' The ninety-fifth Psalm is quoted as what '*the Holy Ghost saith.*' The 110th Psalm is given as the direct address of Jehovah to His Son. Jeremiah's description of the new covenant is again what '*He saith*'; and in another connection it is '*the Holy Ghost bearing witness,*' while the fortieth Psalm is what '*Christ saith when He cometh into the world.*' In these various ways the authoritative character of the inspired Word is distinctly declared, in harmony with the definite statement in the opening verse, 'God having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners.' Thus, however varied



the character of these portions, however diverse the method in which they were given, they are *all Inspired*. God spoke in them all, and hence their authority.

In the Epistle of James there are more allusions than direct quotations, but these are sufficient to show that he, too, rested on the authority of the Old Testament, and for him what the 'Scripture saith' was the standard of appeal.

In the Epistles of Peter we have many quotations and references. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Psalms, Proverbs, and Isaiah are all laid under contribution, and besides the proof which is thus afforded of the reverence in which Peter held the Scriptures, we have several important expressions directly asserting their Inspiration and supremacy. Thus, he identifies the Gospel with 'the word of the Lord,' which 'endureth for ever'; he tells his readers to remember the words which were 'spoken before by the holy prophets.' He declares that when the prophets prophesied of the coming grace, it was the Spirit of Christ which was in them that 'testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the after-glories.' He declares that 'no prophecy ever came by the will of man, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost,' and he asserts that the transfiguration scene, and the revelation of Christ's glory generally, had confirmed the prophetic word. 'We have the word of prophecy made more sure,' not as the Old Version's suggestion, we have a more sure word than the voice from the holy mount, but *because* of that voice, 'we have the prophetic word made more sure'; and to this word as being of Divine inspiration and infallible authority, 'Ye do well that ye take heed as unto a lamp shining in a dark place.'

In John's Epistles we have several allusions, but no direct quotations; and in the Apocalypse a few quotations, but a very large number of allusions; indeed, the whole of that book is steeped in Old Testament thought and diction and imagery, showing how largely it bulked in the mind of John; and it is he that gives us that beautiful aphorism which summarizes all that the other New Testament writers have said of the Old, and shows the highest reason for reverencing it, 'The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.'

Surely we must all feel that the New Testament is bound up with the Old, and must stand or fall with it. Either all these men, and the whole Church of Christ in those early days, were lamentably mistaken, and left in their mistakes by the Spirit of God, or the Old Testament is undoubtedly the Inspired Word of God. Simply considering them as enlightened Christian men, we feel that they give the strongest possible testimony to the authority of that Old Word; but considering them, as we feel we must, as men themselves inspired of God, we see that God through them commends the Old Testament to us, as the Lord Jesus Christ Himself had already done. The whole treatment which these inspired men accord to that Word conclusively shows that they acted upon the dictum of the great Apostle, that 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work.' No man who rejects the Old Testament, no man who lightly esteems it, no man who ignores it, can as a servant of God be 'completely furnished unto every good

work.' No one can truly understand the New Testament who is ignorant of the Old.

Of course we must rightly and wisely interpret that Word. No sane man would open the Old Testament at random and take whatever verse his eye might light upon as a direct command from God to him in regard to present duty. No sensible man would seek to translate the Levitical ritual into practice. It was an Apostolic rule 'to prophesy according to the analogy of the faith,' and we ought to expound Scripture according to the analogy of the faith. We must interpret the Old by the New, but we shall find that the more fully we study both, the more convinced must we be of the truth of Augustine's epigram, '*Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus in Novo patet*'—'The New Testament lies hidden in the Old, the Old lies open in the New.'

## LECTURE VI.

THE APOSTLES' USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, PROVING THE  
EXTENT OF THE INSPIRATION AND THE UNSOUNDNESS OF THE  
HIGHER CRITICISM AS TO THE HISTORICAL ACCURACY OF  
THE OLD TESTAMENT.

HAVING seen that the Apostolic quotations prove the *Authority and Inspiration* of the Old Testament, we have next to consider what witness these quotations bear to the *extent* of that Inspiration. It will not, however, be necessary to dwell long upon this point, as it has already been somewhat involved in the consideration of the previous part, since the whole practice of the Apostles in so constantly appealing to individual passages can hardly be understood on any other supposition than that they attached inspiration to the very language.

We believe that as Christ's treatment of the Scriptures warranted the conclusion that He considered them *Verbally* Inspired, so we can draw a similar conclusion from the Apostles' treatment of them.

When Matthew quotes the passage from Isaiah about the birth of Jesus, the whole point of the application turns upon the words 'virgin' and 'Immanuel.' In the quotation from Micah, 'Bethlehem' and 'Judah' are of decisive importance. The prophecy applied to the ministry of Christ

in Galilee derives its appropriateness from the words 'Zebulon,' 'Naphtali,' 'Galilee of the Gentiles.' In the prediction of Jehovah's servant in Matthew xii. almost every word seems of special moment. In John's quotation from the twenty-second Psalm, how verbally correct is the description parting the garments among them, casting lots for His vesture! So in the quotation from Zechariah, 'They shall look on Him whom they *pierced*'; this is the one word which rightly describes the fact.

In all Peter's quotations on the day of Pentecost, how vital is every phrase to the validity of his argument! For example, in the citation from Joel, the words, 'I will pour out of My Spirit,' 'prophecy,' 'show wonders.' In the quotation from the sixteenth Psalm unless the very words, 'Because Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt Thou give Thy Holy One to see corruption,' are inspired, it is difficult to see how the argument could be supported. Especially does Peter insist upon the importance of that word 'corruption' as proving that the prophecy must refer, not to David, but to David's Lord; and into the same chain of reasoning he links the passage from the one hundred and tenth Psalm, giving special prominence to the phrase, 'Sit Thou at my right hand.'

In the prayer of the Church (Acts iv.) it is the mention of the 'rage of the *Gentiles*,' 'the peoples,' and the plotting of 'kings' and 'rulers' against God's 'anointed' that warrants the application of the second Psalm to the tragedy of the Cross, 'For of a truth in this city *against* Thy holy Servant, Jesus, whom Thou didst *anoint*, both *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*, with the *Gentiles* and the *peoples* of Israel, were gathered together.'

In Paul's speech reported in Acts xiii., among other important words, we find again that word 'corruption' from the sixteenth Psalm, and upon it Paul founds the same important argument which we have seen Peter using. Equally important in its way as supplying the basis of the argument for taking the Gospel beyond the pale of Judaism is the wording of the prophecy cited from Isaiah, '*a light to the Gentiles,*' '*salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth.*' Again, in the twenty-eighth of Acts, the prophecy quoted by Christ, and verbally applied to the unbelieving Jews, is applied by Paul to the leading Jews at Rome, its force largely lying in the very phraseology in which it is couched.

How often throughout the Epistles the stress of the reasoning falls upon particular words and phrases! Thus, in Rom. iii., '*none* righteous,' '*none* that understandeth,' '*none* that seeketh after God,' only the absolute negative could bear the weight of the Apostle's argument. In Rom. iv. the reasoning turns upon the words 'believed' and 'reckoned for righteousness'; on these are built the whole doctrine of salvation by grace, justification by faith, as exemplified in the case of Abraham and also of David. In Rom. vii. 7 the Apostle shows that it was the power of one word that startled him into the consciousness of sin, 'Thou shalt not *covet.*' In the ninth chapter of the same Epistle, the defining words, '*in Isaac* shall thy seed be called,' fully support the Apostle in his contention that there was a spiritual Israel within the natural Israel, a seed according to promise. In the same chapter the words '*My* people' and '*not My* people,' in the quotation from Hosea, are the principal ones. In the tenth chapter the discussion mainly turns upon the signification of certain words, as



'doeth' (verse 5), 'ascend,' 'descend' (verses 6, 7), 'nigh Thee' (verse 8), and in the conclusion the word 'whosoever' has a prominent place, while the quotations that follow from Isaiah would be pointless apart from the special force of such words as 'believing,' 'report,' 'gainsaying.' In the eleventh chapter the phrase, 'I have *left for* myself,' materially helps the Apostle in his proof of the existence of a 'remnant' according to the election of grace; in the fourteenth chapter the occurrence of the words, '*every* knee,' '*every* tongue,' in the passage adduced warrants him to declare, 'So, then, every one of us shall give account of himself to God'; while in the fifteenth chapter the word 'Gentiles' in four particular quotations bears him to his triumphant conclusion.

In 1 Cor. xv., how necessary to the writer's antithetical argument is the phrase, as applied to Adam, 'living soul,' and, in 2 Cor. vi., 'acceptable time.'

In Gal. iii., the use the Apostle makes of the singular 'seed,' rather than the plural 'seeds,' strikes every reader; but hardly less prominent and important is the word 'faith' in the quotation, 'The just shall live by faith;,' while the words 'bond' and 'free' play an important part in the argument of the fourth chapter.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews very much depends upon the use of particular words—as 'Son' in the first quotation from the Psalms, and 'God' in the second, 'Thy throne, O *God*;' in the second chapter the word 'brethren'; in the third, 'to-day' and 'rest'; in the fifth and seventh, 'priest for ever,' 'order of Melchizedek'; in the eighth, 'new covenant'; and, to mention no other, the important phrase in the twelfth chapter, 'yet once more.'

Many more such instances might be given, but these specimens of the way in which the Apostles reasoned upon the quotations they made are sufficient to show that they proceeded upon the belief that the very language was inspired.

It is true that sometimes it is the general drift of the passage which is given, and an exact rendering of the Hebrew is wanting; but the fact that in any instance the exact words are treated as of vital import shows that Verbal Inspiration was attributed to these particular passages, and as the Apostles manifestly considered the Scriptures as a whole, and treated every part with equal reverence, we are warranted in predicating Verbal Inspiration of the whole. Believers in Plenary and Verbal Inspiration can consistently give the drift of a passage when that is all they want for a particular purpose, since their belief in the inspiration of the *words* necessarily carries with it the inspiration of the *thoughts*, and they may express the thought in other words when once, by a study of the particular words of the passage, they have grasped the thought; but those who hold that the thought *alone* is inspired, and not the words—the expression of the thought—cannot consistently base arguments on particular words and phrases. But as the Apostles not only gave the thought, in some instances, without dwelling on the words, but also in very many cases insist upon the specific meaning of particular words, it is evident that they believed in Verbal Inspiration. Besides, if we believe that the Apostles were themselves inspired, a quotation given by them in language slightly varying from the original would, even in the variation, partake of inspiration—it would simply be the Spirit

in them quoting His own utterances as given through the Old Testament writers; and as a human author may quote from his own works, giving the substance of the meaning in other words, so the Divine Author of the Old Testament may quote His own sentiments, and give to them a new expression. This is a point to which we shall again have occasion to refer.

I pass on to speak more particularly of the bearing of the Apostolic quotations upon the theories of the Higher Criticism; and, first, as to the HISTORICAL ACCURACY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We shall look at the events alluded to in the New Testament in the order of their occurrence in the Old, and, first, *The Work of Creation*. This great work is referred to in several places. John, speaking of Christ the Word being in the beginning with God, asserts that 'all things were made by Him.' Undoubtedly there is a reference to the opening verses of Genesis, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' So Peter, in his Second Epistle, alludes to the chaotic condition described in the same chapter when he says, 'There were heavens from old, and an earth compacted out of water and amidst water, by the word of God.' Then, in Heb. xi., it is stated, 'By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God.' The word here used is *αἰών*, which generally may be rendered 'age' as referring to the time aspect, the life of the world, the dispensation; but in this passage, as also at Heb. i., we must take it as referring to the material world. It would be rather forced to take it as 'ages' in these two passages; indeed, it is a Socinian interpretation, which has in view the lowering of Christ's

dignity. 'By whom He made the ages,' 'arranged the dispensations'—that certainly comes short of what the writer means to express. He is insisting upon the superlative dignity of Jesus, His absolute Godhead. He is the brightness of His Father's glory, the express image of His person. He is the maker of the worlds, and He is the upholder of *all* things, evidently the '*all things*' in the one clause being equivalent to the 'worlds' in the other, and so agreeing with the other passages in which such works are predicated of Christ, as, *e.g.*, Colossians, 'All things have been created through Him, and unto Him; and in Him all things consist—are held together.' That is one reason why we take the word in Heb. xi. to mean the 'material worlds'; but the whole wording of the passage seems to shut us up to that interpretation, 'So that what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear.' Material and visible are the qualities denoted, and not simply temporal, as the word 'age' would suggest. And then it is by *faith* that we know anything about the creation, and throughout the chapter '*faith*' is shown to be a resting upon evidence, and we are at once led to the account in Genesis as the source of information. Faith accepts that narrative as an inspired account of the matter, and thus 'by faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God.' Again, in 2 Cor. iv., we have the passage, 'God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness,' of course alluding to that creative fiat expressed in language so worthy of a God that even a heathen rhetorician gives it as a fine example of the sublime in language, 'God said, Let there be light, and there was light.' To the same account there is a distinct reference in the prayer of the Church (Acts iv.), 'Thou that

didst make the earth, and the sea, and all that in them is.' Further, in Heb. iv., we read, 'The works were finished from the foundation of the world; for He hath said somewhere of the seventh day in this wise, And God rested on the seventh from all His works.' Thus, by four or five different writers, this creation story is treated as authentic history. Even the Critics cannot deny that these writers understood Genesis to be an actual narration of facts, and we hold that they knew what they were writing about. In the last passage quoted, you will have noticed that what the Critics call the post-Exilic narrative of P, which is to be considered as mainly a reminiscence of the Babylonian tradition of creation, the writer of Hebrews calls the statement of God Himself, 'For *He hath said* somewhere;' and the very way in which this quotation is adduced implies that all the Scripture is the Word of God. 'He hath said *somewhere*' — no matter where in the whole Old Testament, since throughout God is speaking by His servants; so that when the Critics tell us that in this first chapter of Genesis we have an unknown writer's representation of a mythical tradition, and that his conception of God is very different from that entertained by the writer of the second chapter, and that the narrative is altogether mythical, ideal, legendary, we simply, taking our stand upon the New Testament, reply, What is recorded in Genesis is what *He hath said*.

2. *The creation of man.* We have several allusions to this important fact. In the account given in the first chapter of Genesis it is stated that God made man in His own image, after His own likeness. In 1 Cor. xi. Paul declares that man was made in the image of God, and James in the third chapter of his Epistle says that man 'was made

after the likeness of God,' while in Eph. iv. 24 Paul tacitly endorses the account of the first creation when he describes the new man which 'after God is created in righteousness and true holiness'; so also in Col. iii. 10, 'the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.' Thus far the references are to the first chapter of Genesis, the priestly narrative of P, to use the jargon of the Critics; but we have a further account of man's creation in the second chapter, and this the Critics perversely declare to be antagonistic to P's account, and that the author J has an entirely different idea of the creation from what P has. P simply represents man as created by the Divine fiat: while J, more anthropomorphic in his conceptions, represents God as laboriously gathering His materials, preparing them (*e.g.*, moistening the clay), and shaping them by personal manipulation. J speaks of Adam being first made, and afterwards Eve formed as his companion, whereas 'in P, man and woman are created together; and so definite is the statement as to lead some to suppose the idea of the writer to have been that man was created a hermaphrodite.' Now, of course, any reader can see that there is a variation in the two accounts, but that they are inconsistent and contradictory could only be the verdict of superficial study or critical ingenuity. Indeed, the way in which the Critics magnify and multiply difficulties makes one think that they must indulge in a good deal of 'laborious manipulation.' The first chapter is what it claims to be—a summary account of the great facts of creation; the second chapter is what it claims to be—the generations of the heavens and the earth, a detailed account of the formation of man, and



the furnishing of his abode; the one is the complement of the other, and by putting both together we get something like a full idea of the creation of man. But certainly if the Critics' theory is of any force both accounts cannot be true. If P is right, J is wrong; if J is to be credited, P must be repudiated. We have seen that Paul and James accept P's account, and endorse it. How is J's treated? In 1 Cor. xv. Paul says, 'The first man is of the earth, earthy.' Isn't that just an echo of the second of Genesis, 'The Lord God formed the man out of the dust of the ground'? In the same chapter it is stated that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul; and in that chapter of 1 Cor. Paul says, 'It is written, The first man Adam became a living soul.' So, in harmony with the so-called J's account of the subsequent creation of the woman, Paul, in 1 Tim. ii., says, 'For Adam was first formed, and then Eve'; and in 1 Cor. xi. he says, 'The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man, for neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man'; and so in Eph. v. 31 he quotes the Scripture, 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the twain shall become one flesh'; and again in 1 Cor. vi. 16, 'For the twain, *saith he*, shall become one flesh.' Thus the absolute historical character of the second of Genesis is established as surely as that of the first, and even more in detail. Paul evidently saw no contradiction, no inconsistency between the two accounts; sublimely indifferent to the critical theories, he drew upon both narratives for his particulars, for they were to him but one. He considered the whole as inspired history, as what 'he saith'; and Paul's method

of interpretation, while assuredly according to inspired wisdom, is also in harmony with common-sense.

3. *The fall of man.* The Higher Critics generally treat the account of the Fall as mythical—a view held, indeed, long before the modern developments of the partition theories, and many who may not accept the diversity of authorship have yet believed in the legendary character of this particular portion. Very decisive is the New Testament witness to the historicity of this sad and tragical narrative. In the fifth of Romans, Paul founds one of his greatest arguments upon the fact of the fall of Adam. From that marvellous piece of reasoning we cull these phrases as bearing upon our subject: ‘Through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin’; ‘Death reigned from Adam’; ‘After the likeness of Adam’s transgression’; ‘By the trespass of the one’; ‘Not as through one that sinned’; ‘The judgment came of one offence unto condemnation’; ‘By the trespass of the one death reigned through the one’; ‘Through one trespass judgment came upon all men’; ‘Through one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners.’ How thoroughly is that one act of the one man interwoven into the tissues of the reasoning! Again, in that other great argument in 1 Cor. xv. (these two passages, Rom. v. and 1 Cor. xv., were described by Mr. Gracey as ‘two of the most momentous pieces of logical deduction with which the world has ever been favoured’) he rests upon the fact that ‘by man came death’; that ‘in Adam all died.’ But one might say Paul only speaks of Adam’s sin; he takes no notice of Eve’s part in the transgression. That is so in those particular passages where he is dealing with the representative

character of Adam, but elsewhere he recognises the literal accuracy of the other details. Thus in 1 Tim. ii. 14, 'Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression.' In 2 Cor. xi. 3 the other actor in the tragedy is mentioned, 'As the *serpent* beguiled Eve in his craftiness.' Thus we have the exact series as given in Genesis: the serpent seducing Eve, then Eve persuading Adam; and the way in which the Apostle speaks in the passage in Timothy seems to warrant Milton's lines—

'He scrupled not to eat,  
Against his better knowledge; not deceived,  
But fondly overcome with female charms.'

Instead of making any further remark on the bearing of the passages, I venture to quote words which some of you may have been privileged to hear before, although the quotation will remind us how much we have lost in the removal of him who spoke them—our late beloved Principal Gracey. Speaking on these two passages in Romans and Corinthians as proving the doctrine of total depravity, he incidentally says: 'These inspired allusions will serve another and a more immediate purpose. They form a commentary on the original narrative, and throw a light thereon, by which we may read it aright. Under that light we shall be enabled to read the account given in the third of Genesis in all the simplicity of a real history. The stamp of reality and literalness comes out unmistakably under the light of the various references to the detailed and moving incidents of that great tragedy. My meaning is not that a reader of this history must suspend his judgment as to its reality until he hears what the rest of Scripture has to say on the subject. I hold that, without the help of any

comment, a plain, unprejudiced reader will be struck with the air of reality pervading the entire narrative. The connection in which it stands, the coherence of the different parts of the account, the improbability that a fable, or myth, or parable should be introduced at such a time, and in such a manner, all go to produce the conviction that this is a veritable history of the same sort as that in whose company it is found. Now, the special value of the Scripture references is not so much to convey this view to our mind as to corroborate it, and to prevent us from taking another. We have thus in them a gauge of interpretation, and anything below that gauge must be discarded. That gauge is the full acknowledgment of both the real and the literal elements in the narrative. By the application of this gauge we must reject all those explanations which tell us, 1st, that we have here a historical *mythos* or fable, *i.e.*, a fictitious narrative founded on some historical fact; or, 2nd, a history "infallibly true without being real (whatever that may mean), originally existing in the form of a *saga*, then encased in a hieroglyph, and at length disentombed by Moses" (Van Oosterzee); or, 3rd, an allegory, founded on fact or not, whose object may be to convey certain views of the experience of man in the process of transition or development (*e.g.*, an allegory, teaching the loss of the golden age; the transition of man from instinct to rational liberty; the pernicious effects of longing after a higher condition; several of these ideas at the same time). Now, were these interpretations capable of defence on their own merits,—and they have all been long ago exploded, though they are continually being revived in some shape or other; yet they cannot be upheld against the Scriptures quoted. This is

clear, especially from the incidental references in the two Epistles of Paul. By the stress of these theories their advocates would be compelled to ask us to believe that the Apostle founds his teaching in both cases, not on what they would call the kernel, but the shell, of the real history. As if the Apostle were not able, by reason of use, to discern between things so different as the kernel and the shell! As if Paul had no inkling of the Higher Criticism reserved for these more advanced times! As if the writings of Philo, the literary father of these fanciful theories, were not extant in Paul's time, and he were in ignorance of them! The fact is that what is now called the "Higher Criticism" was rife in the time of the Apostle, and in the schools in which he was trained: and he despised it, and instead gave a plain and literal interpretation. By this way he shows in both the passages cited that the very minute details of the narrative contain or reflect great truths that are wrought into the very fabric of our nature, and facts that have influenced the history of our race.'

4. *The story of Cain and Abel.* In Heb. xi. there is mention of the fact of Abel offering a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, and receiving the Divine approval in consequence. In 1 John iii. 12 the Apostle takes an illustration from the murder of Abel by Cain, and the motive that led to it. In Heb. xii. 24 the Blood of sprinkling is said to speak better things than that of Abel, with evident allusion to the statement in Genesis, 'The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto Me from the ground'; and in Jude 11 certain ungodly men are said to have 'gone in the way of *Cain*.' It would be amusing, were it not so deplorable, to hear how the Critics talk about this fourth chapter

of Genesis. Among other things, they find that the J section gives a representation of God's dealings 'in accordance with a conception of God, which P could not, and never did, entertain'; but it is evident that the difficulties are in the Critics' representation or misrepresentation of the so-called J's representation—*e.g.*, they gravely declare that God is here represented 'as in *heated conversation* with Cain!' A very serious phase of their theory comes to light in this connection also. They speak of J taking for granted the forms of sacrifice, and all the accounts of sacrifices offered by the patriarchs are alleged to be in the J portions. But say they, 'In P, no patriarch ever sacrifices or builds an altar. All this was yet to be revealed. It is only when the ritual is instituted at Sinai, Aaron and his sons ordained, *the* altar built, and fire has descended from heaven, that men *may* sacrifice.' So that if we believe J, sacrifice was the appointed means of access to God from the time of the Fall; but if we follow P, we must hold that no sacrifice was offered or accepted until after the Exodus, that for twenty-five centuries sinners could hold fellowship with a holy God, apart from *bloodshedding*. Assuredly both accounts cannot be historically true, and, indeed, the Critics do not consider either true, but simply the different conceptions of these writers. But since such men as Driver and others declare that the Higher Criticism 'presupposes the inspiration' of the writers, we would have to believe that God inspired one man to say that sacrifice had always been the approved way of access to Himself, and inspired another to say that He was never approached by sacrifice until the Aaronic priesthood was established! God is not the author of confusion, and from all such confusion and contradiction,



suppositions and mistakes, we are delivered by rejecting the critical theory, and holding fast the New Testament interpretation, which confirms the old belief in the absolute historicity of this portion, and, consequently, the need from the beginning of sacrifice, and the Divine approval of the sacrifice which, attended by bloodshedding prefiguring the great expiation, and offered in faith, brought glory to God and peace to the worshipper.

5. *Enoch*. The episode of Enoch is a short but pregnant one. The bare genealogical table in the fifth of Genesis, with its sad monotone, 'and he died,' is suddenly brightened by the incisive and cheerful variation, 'Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him.' Here, again, we are told is a beautiful *mythos*; but no, says the writer of Hebrews; it is sober history. 'By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death, and he was not found because God had translated him; for before his translation he hath had witness borne to him that he had been well pleasing unto God.' Yes, adds Jude, it is true, and this man Enoch was a prophet, and, according to Genesis, he was 'the seventh from Adam.' Be it known unto you, brethren, that this fifth of Genesis is from the pen of P, with the exception of the 29th verse, which is attributed to J, because the word Jehovah occurs in it. At your leisure read the 28th and 30th verses connectedly, and if you do not feel that either the 29th verse, or something similar, is wanted, I shall be surprised. Your admiration for the ingenuity of the Critics may be heightened when you know that the descendants of Cain, as given in chapter iv. by J, are the same persons whom P, in the fifth, represents as the descendants of Seth! Of course, the names are

a little mixed up, but you can see the similarity, and you may easily identify Kenan the son of Enoch in the fifth, with Cain the son of Adam in the fourth, while Jabal the son of Lamech is plainly 'Abel' the son of Adam and brother of Cain. I hardly think, however, that the acceptance of these results of the Critics' investigation will tend to give a very high opinion of the historical faculty of P and J, even when supplemented by the diversified genius of the Redactor!

6. *Noah*. We have seen how emphatically Christ asserted the reality of the Flood in the days of Noah; the evidence of the Apostles is no less pointed. In Heb. xi. we have the Divine warning to Noah, the preparation of the ark, the salvation of Noah's family, the destruction of the world; in 1 Peter iii. 20, the long suffering of God, the striving of the Spirit, while the ark was being made, the salvation of the eight members of Noah's family; and in 2 Peter ii. 5 we have the direct action of God in bringing the Flood, destroying the ungodly, and preserving Noah with seven others. These references are sufficient to stamp all the details of the narrative with the impress of actual history. Time forbids me to give any account of the way in which the critical imagination runs riot throughout this narrative. I pass on to note.

7. *The History of Abraham*. The references to Abraham are specially numerous; indeed, I confess to a measure of surprise at finding them so many and so varied, covering such a large part of the patriarch's life. In Mary's song and the prophecy of Zacharias, as recorded in Luke's Gospel, the promise and the oath made to Abraham are mentioned. In Peter's address in the third of Acts, the promise is again

noted. In the comprehensive address of Stephen the following facts in the life of Abraham are mentioned: His call, his removal from Mesopotamia to Haran, the death of his father in Haran, his arrival in Canaan, his pilgrim life therein, God's promise of the land as his inheritance, the prediction of the bondage in Egypt and subsequent deliverance, the birth of Isaac, his circumcision by Divine direction on the eighth day, and purchase of a burying-ground from the sons of Hamor. In Rom. iv. Paul indicates these facts: Abraham's believing God, and having righteousness imputed to him, the institution and purport of circumcision, his own circumcision, the promise of the inheritance, the promise of a numerous posterity, his unwavering faith in God's promise of a son despite his being 100 years of age and Sarah also being advanced in years. In Rom. ix. he speaks of Abraham as the father of the Jewish nation, but especially of the spiritual Israel according to the promise, 'In Isaac shall thy seed be called'; giving also the other promise, 'Sarah shall have a son.' In Galatians Paul mentions again Abraham's faith and justification, the promise of blessing through his seed, the birth of Ishmael, the name and condition of the mother, Hagar the bondmaid, the birth of Isaac, the episode of Ishmael's mocking Isaac, and the consequent expulsion of Hagar and her son from the patriarch's household.

In Hebrews we find mention made again of the promise and oath of God to Abraham; of the slaughter of the kings; of the meeting with Melchizedek, and a description of him in accordance with the narrative in Genesis—and, by the way, how much of the Apostle's argument is reared upon the assumption that Melchizedek was an actual personage;

Then in the eleventh of the same Epistle we have the call of Abraham; his ready obedience; his pilgrim life in Canaan, dwelling in tents (a slight but interesting touch being added here 'with Isaac and Jacob.' A cursory reader of Genesis would be apt to pronounce this a mistake, as the death of Abraham is recorded before the birth of Jacob; but a careful comparison of the respective ages and times will show that Jacob was fifteen years of age at the death of his grandfather, so that the Apostle is strictly accurate and gives evidence of very careful study of the history when he says 'dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob,' and an interesting and pathetic glimpse it gives of that grand old man happy in the society not only of the beloved Isaac, but also of Isaac's boy).

To return to the particulars in this chapter, we have the faith of Sarah, the birth of Isaac, the trial of Abraham's faith in the offering up of Isaac, and the happy issue of it all. James tells also of the faith and justification of Abraham, and the manifestation of that faith in the offering up of Isaac. Peter finds an illustration to enforce his teaching on the subjection of wives to their husbands, from the Scriptural account that 'Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord'; while he also speaks of that notable incident in the history of Abraham, the destruction of Sodom and the cities of the plain, and the deliverance of Lot; and Jude has an allusion to the same event. The bare recital of these allusions is enough to show not only that the New Testament writers believed that the life of Abraham as recorded in Genesis was veritable history, but history of a very important character, having far-reaching spiritual and doctrinal applications. Take all the allusions to Abraham

out of the Epistles and you remove the foundation of many important arguments, and deprive others of most forcible illustrations. Of course you will understand without my saying it that these references are taken indiscriminately from the supposed diverse and inconsistent accounts of P, J and E; but I cannot stop to give you any examples of the wise folly of the Critics with regard to this important narrative.

We have already seen the notices of the birth of Isaac; briefly note the following references to:

8. *The history of Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph.* In the fourth of John we read of the parcel of ground in the neighbourhood of Shechem which Jacob gave to his son Joseph; and the historical account of the purchase by Jacob, and the subsequent possession by Joseph's son, we find in Genesis and Joshua. In the seventh of Acts we have the birth of Jacob and that of his twelve sons, who became the fathers of the nations, and so are called patriarchs; the envy of these patriarchs against Joseph, and their selling him into Egypt; Joseph's affliction in Egypt, and subsequent exaltation through the favour of King Pharaoh; the famine; the journeys of the brethren to Egypt for corn; the disclosure of Joseph to them; their presentation to Pharaoh; Joseph's sending for his father and all his kindred; Jacob's descent into Egypt with his household; his death, and burial in Abraham's burying-ground. Some of these details are wonderfully delicate in their accuracy, as, for instance, it is *Jacob* who hears that there is corn in Egypt; it is on their *second* visit that Joseph is made known unto his brethren. In Rom. ix. we have Isaac and Rebecca mentioned; the birth of Jacob and Esau; the choice of Jacob in preference

to the firstborn. In Heb. xi. we are told of Isaac blessing Jacob and Esau; of Jacob, when dying, blessing the sons of Joseph; of Joseph, in prospect of death, giving directions for the carrying of his bones out of Egypt when the Exodus should take place. In the twelfth chapter we have Esau selling his birthright, and his vain and tearful attempt to change his father's purpose, so as to obtain the blessing of the firstborn which had been given to Jacob. Again, we remark that all the fancied discrepancies and contradictions which the Critics find in the various accounts of these events were unnoticed by the Apostles and unknown to them. To them the whole story is one, and entirely reliable. These allusions and quotations, extending from the creation to the death of Joseph, cover the whole Book of Genesis, and prove it all to be literally and historically true. We pass on to notice briefly in order the other historical events verified in the New Testament.

9. *The Exodus under Moses and the wilderness life.* When so much is said of the life of Abraham, we might expect that prominence would be given to such an important event as the Exodus, and we are not disappointed. In Peter's speech in Acts iii. the great prediction of Moses concerning the 'Prophet' is quoted, carrying us back to the historic scene when the words were spoken. Turning again to Stephen's speech, we have a glimpse of the condition from which the Exodus rescued the people; the rising of the king who knew not Joseph; his ill-treatment of the people; the cruel edict respecting the drowning of the male children; the birth and beauty of Moses; his exposure; his rescue and adoption by Pharaoh's daughter; his visit to his oppressed brethren when about forty years of age; his



smiting of the Egyptian in defence of the Hebrew; the episode of the following day, which led to his flight from Egypt; his sojourn and marriage in the land of Midian his vision of God at the burning bush; his commission to deliver the people; the miracles wrought in Egypt, and the leading forth of the people through the Red Sea and into the wilderness; his prediction of the coming Prophet; his receiving of the law for the people; their disobedience, and desire to return into Egypt; their persuading Aaron to make a calf, and worshipping it; and the erection of the tabernacle according to the pattern seen in the mount. In Paul's address at Antioch he mentions the deliverance from Egypt and the forty years' wandering in the wilderness. In Rom. v. he speaks of death reigning from Adam to Moses. In the eleventh chapter he speaks of God's declaration of sovereignty to Moses and of the punishment of Pharaoh. In 1 Cor. x. he mentions the passage through the sea; the baptism unto Moses; the giving of the manna; the water from the rock; the disobedience, lust, and idolatry of the people, with the punishment that overtook them. In 2 Cor. iii. he speaks of the tables of stone; of the old covenant, of which Moses was the administrator; of the glory seen on Moses' face through intercourse with God; of the veil with which he covered his face. In Heb. iii. Moses' fidelity in the house of God is mentioned; also the unbelief of the people who came out of Egypt by Moses; their forty years' wandering on account of God's displeasure with them for their sins. In the seventh chapter we have allusions to the Levitical and Aaronic priesthood instituted by Moses. In the eighth we have the directions for the making of the tabernacle; in the ninth a description of the

tabernacle, its furniture, and its services; notice even being taken of Aaron's rod that budded, the golden pot of manna, and the tables of stone. In the tenth chapter we are reminded of the fact that a man that set at nought Moses' law died without mercy, under two or three witnesses. In the eleventh chapter we have the birth of Moses; his three months' concealment by his parents; his refusal to be recognised as the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and his resolve to cast in his lot with the oppressed Hebrews; his keeping of the Passover; the passage of the Red Sea; and the overthrow of the Egyptians. In the twelfth chapter we have a vivid description of the awe-inspiring scene at Sinai, when God descended on the mount, and even Moses feared exceedingly. In 2 Peter and Jude we note several incidents of the wilderness life. The case of Balaam; the overthrow of the people for their unbelief; the sedition, and destruction of Korah. Thus, practically the whole of Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy are endorsed; P, and J, and E, and D, and P 1 and P 2, J 1 and J 2 and R, and all the rest of the Critics' men of straw, with their legendary tales, erroneous conceptions, false representations, are swept away, and the whole Pentateuch appears as a Divinely authenticated history speaking to men of all ages with the very voice of God.

We must take a very hasty glance at the remaining evidence. The Book of Joshua is endorsed by Stephen, when he speaks of Joshua and the fathers bringing in the tabernacle with them, when they entered on the possession of the nations which God thrust out; by Paul in the 13th of Acts, when he speaks of the destruction of the seven nations in the land of Canaan, and the possession of their land as an

inheritance by the people of Israel. So also in the fourth chapter of Hebrews, Joshua is spoken of as leading the people into Canaan; and in the eleventh the fall of Jericho, and the faith of Rahab are mentioned; while James also commemorates the same woman's act of faith. So the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings are verified by Paul's statement: 'After these things he gave them Judges, until Samuel the prophet, and afterwards they asked for a king, and God gave unto them Saul the son of Kish, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, for the space of forty years, and when He had removed him He raised up David to be their King, to whom also He bare witness, and said, I have found David, the son of Jesse, a man after My heart who shall do all My will.' Is not that a bird's-eye view of the whole history of these books? And the same thing you have in Stephen's statement, 'Unto David, who found favour in the sight of God, and asked to find a habitation for the God of Jacob; but Solomon built him a house.' In Romans xi. you have the account of Elijah in his despondency encouraged by the Lord's declaration concerning the remnant who had not bowed to Baal; while James speaks of Elijah's prayerfulness, and the miracles accomplished thereby. I will not repeat the Critics' view of David, which I gave you in a former lecture; I only remark now that in these passages there are distinct references to those very episodes in the life of Saul and David, which they treat as legendary and unworthy of credence.

Thus we may say that the entire historical portion of the Old Testament is, in the New Testament, treated as history, and is accredited beyond the shadow of a doubt. If more particulars are not given about other historical characters,

we may take it, it is because, as Paul says, 'the time would fail to tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephtha; of David and Samuel, and the Prophets who, through faith, subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, from weakness were made strong, waxed mighty in war, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.' But all these were real personages, 'of whom the world was not worthy'; they had part in the life of faith which we share; they are examples to us because they were actual men who lived by faith. They all had witness borne to them through their faith, and they now compass us about as a cloud of witnesses, and woe be unto us if we be found faithless!

In concluding this part of our subject, may we not say that it is absolutely clear that the Apostles are entirely at variance with the Critics as to the historical value of the Old Testament? The Critics themselves admit this, but their hypothesis that the Apostles 'did not know any better' cannot be accepted by those who believe in the full Inspiration of the Apostles. We accept the word of an Apostle before the word of an Oxford or a German critic any day. Even if they were not absolutely inspired, we could still place reliance upon their words, as rightly rendering the lessons learned from their Master; but when we have to add the fact of their Inspiration there is no place left for doubt. If the Spirit of God led them into all the truth, He could not leave them in ignorance of such grave matters as the Critics profess to have discovered. He could not allow them to build up momentous and vital arguments upon false and misleading premises.

It is further very evident that just as Christ rejected the false traditions of the Jews, while accepting the whole Old Testament, so Paul, while thus venerating the Scriptures, made short work of unauthorized traditions. Thus he warns Timothy not to give 'heed to fables,' to 'refuse profane and old wives' fables,' and bids Titus reprove certain men 'sharply, that they may be sound in the faith, not giving heed to *Jewish fables* and commandments of men.' So that it is idle to speak of Paul and his fellows simply accommodating their teaching to the prejudices of the people. In no spirit of accommodation, but in the Spirit of their Master, did they proclaim the authority of that Word in its entirety, because they believed it to be the Word of God, and having the same belief we shall reverence that Word, and repudiate the fictions and fancies of the Critics, as 'profane and old wives' fables.'

## LECTURE VII.

THE APOSTLES' TESTIMONY AS TO THE MOSAIC ORIGIN OF  
CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF CERTAIN  
BOOKS.

*THE Mosaic origin of certain institutions* is very clearly indicated in the quotations and allusions we have been considering.

1. *The Law.* John distinctly declares '*The law was given by Moses.*' As we have seen, the Higher Critics, or at least some of them, admit that the 'law did originate with Moses,' and that in a *modified* form his teaching may reasonably be supposed to be embodied in the Decalogue. But the New Testament speaks of the law in its entirety as recorded in the Pentateuch, as other passages will show. Even while admitting that the nucleus of the law and of the ceremonial observances may be traced to Moses, the Critics speak as if Moses had himself laid down these principles as the founder of the religious life of the nation, and they pay small regard to the consistent representations of the Pentateuch, that Moses was but the instrument, the medium of communication between God and the people, and that God Himself was the Author. The New Testament is very careful on this point, and while sometimes speaking generally of the law of Moses clearly shows that Moses did not speak of himself. So in this passage 'the law was given



by Moses,' it is the Greek *dia* that is used, indicating instrumentality; given not *by* in the sense of origin, as our version might suggest, but *by* = *through*. So in Acts vii. 38 Stephen says that Moses 'received living oracles to give unto us.' Here we have the *origin* of the law—received from God, or, as mentioned in the previous verse, the angel of the Covenant who spake with him in the mount; the *nature* of the law—'*living oracles*'; the *medium* of communication—*Moses* received *to give*; and then we have the abiding personal privilege and responsibility—to *give unto us*. That last phrase overthrows the Critics' contention—that we have at best only the modified form of the Mosaic germ. Stephen, speaking by the Holy Ghost, declares that all that Moses received from God to give was given, not simply to the people, then, but to '*us*,' and only in the sense of having the whole of these Divine communications preserved in the Pentateuch could that be true. In Romans iii., having in the previous chapter discussed the attitude of the Jew to the law, the Apostle answers his own question as to the advantage possessed by the Jew, 'Much every way, first of all that they were entrusted with the oracles of God.' The same word is used that Stephen uses, and though Moses is not mentioned, it is evident that Paul is thinking of the same fact, and referring to the law given through Moses, which became the precious deposit to be guarded throughout the ages by the privileged people. At the same time, we may suppose that the word 'oracles' in this connection includes the rest of the Scriptures, which are placed on a level with the Pentateuch. In the fifth of Romans, the Apostle shows that the coming in of the law brought condemnation, and he traced that law—of course,

the law with which he was familiar—to Moses. In 2 Cor. iii. he alludes to the fact that the Decalogue was written upon the tables of stone, and relates the incident of Moses veiling the glory of his face on his descent from the mount. According to the Critics, the veiling is recorded by P, while it is J and E who tell of the writing on the tables of stone; but as both the writing and the outshining of the glory are miraculous, they are to be considered as poetical embellishments. But Pauls finds in them an actual historical basis upon which he founds an important analogy and argument. These tables of stone are again mentioned in Hebrews ix., and the fact of their being placed in the ark as recorded in Exodus. Only one other allusion out of several I mention. In Galatians iii. the Apostle, while he does not mention the name of Moses, distinctly traces the law to the time of the Exodus, when he shows that it was some 400 years after the covenant made with Abraham. The way in which he speaks of it throughout that chapter indicates that it is the law as a whole, ceremonial as well as moral, that he means. That law led to Christ; by its lofty moral precepts showing the inability of men to obtain life by works; and by its types and sacrifices prefiguring the work of Christ, through whom alone life could come. We can understand how the law could serve this purpose through the Divine intent and arrangement; but on the development theory of the Critics, with its survival of the fittest, its accommodation to existing environments, etc., it is not so easy to see how it could be a pedagogue to lead us to Christ.

2. *The Rite of Circumcision.* We saw how Christ traced this to Moses, and beyond him to the patriarchal age, in-

dicating, according to the account of the Pentateuch, that while it was first enjoined upon Abraham, it was afterwards incorporated into the ceremonial law as given through Moses. In perfect harmony with this representation is the rest of the New Testament witness. So Stephen shows that God gave Abraham the covenant of circumcision, and that in accordance therewith he circumcised Isaac on the eighth day, thus plainly referring not to any traditional origin of the rite, but to that origin which the Book of Genesis describes. In the same way Paul, in the fourth of Romans, speaks of the circumcision of Abraham, quoting freely in connection with it the promises in Genesis, showing that he had no other account of the origin of the practice save what the Pentateuch supplied. In the fifteenth of Acts, circumcision is shown to be after the *custom* of Moses, and the observance of it involves the keeping of the whole law; so also in Galatians. In Luke ii. the circumcision of Jesus is recorded, and that is evidently performed in accordance with the requirements of the Mosaic law, for immediately afterwards there is the account of another rite, viz., the purification of Mary, which is distinctly said to be according to the law of Moses, and two passages are quoted, one announcing the law of the consecration of the firstborn, and the other mentioning the sacrifices incumbent upon such as Mary to bring. Both passages are said to be 'written in the law of the Lord.' Now, the whole enactment concerning purification is given in the section from which the second quotation is taken (Leviticus xiii.), and in that same section the circumcision of the child on the eighth day is enjoined. As further proving how utterly foreign to the thought of the New Testament

writers are the theories of the Higher Criticism, it may be mentioned that the two passages which Luke here brings together as alike, 'Written in the law of the Lord,' are, according to the critical analysis, taken, one from P, the other from J E.

3. We have always believed that the *Tabernacle* was erected under the supervision of Moses, who acted under Divine direction, and that all the utensils used in the Tabernacle service were made at the same time. According to the Critics this was not so. It is not quite easy to understand just what they do believe about the matter. But, as far as I can make out, they look upon the whole account of the making of the Tabernacle as part of the ideal picture which P gives of the Mosaic Age. They fancy that, according to J, there was only a simple tent as the scene of God's worship (they seem to admit that there was an ark); and all the elaborate particulars given of the construction and furnishing of the Tabernacle of witness are the inventions of later times. How they can make the so-called account of P harmonize, upon their hypothesis, with any theory of true Inspiration passes comprehension. This writer is represented not only as giving directions concerning a state of things which had passed away at the time he wrote, which would be inconsistent enough, but also concerning a system of worship and a form of sanctuary with its furnishing which never existed. Turning from the critical vagaries to the sure testimony of the New Testament, we find that all the account which the Old Testament gives of the Tabernacle is corroborated and endorsed. Thus saith Stephen, speaking by the Holy Ghost, 'Our fathers had the tabernacle of the testimony in the wilderness, even as He appointed who

spake unto Moses, that he should make it according to the figure that he had seen.' 'Which also our fathers brought in with Joshua, when they entered on the possession of the nations.' So in the eighth of Hebrews we read of the priests serving that which is a copy and shadow of the heavenly things, even as Moses is warned of God when he is about to make the Tabernacle; for 'See, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern that was shown thee in the mount.' And in the ninth chapter we have a description of the Tabernacle with its two compartments—the Holy Place, and the Holiest of all, separated by the veil; and the various articles of furniture are mentioned. The whole thing is shown to be a type of Christ, and it would be strange to find a type of Him in something that had never existed outside the fancy of a priest of post-Exilic days. Here, then, once again the Higher Criticism must join issue with Apostolic testimony, and we have no fear of the result.

4. The Critics say that 'the institution which was among the last to reach a settled state appears to have been the *priesthood*.' The time when it reached a settled state was after the Exile, and the laws which govern it were embodied in P's code. It is, however, admitted that we may 'suppose that some form of priesthood would be established by Moses.' But when we turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we find that the system of priesthood as connected with the Tabernacle worship, and established by Moses, which is there recognised, discussed, and typically expounded, is none other than that form of priesthood which is set forth in the Pentateuch. What the Critics assign to the invention of P after the Exile, is there attributed to the appointment of

the Divinely-guided Moses during the wilderness life; so that we are directed not to the Exile, but to the Exodus—not to some unknown priestly writer, but to the founder of the Hebrew religion, for the important institution of the *priesthood*. I need not stop to speak of the other institutions, the Mosaic origin of which is indicated in the New Testament—as, for instance, in Acts xxi., the purification of those under vows; and in Hebrews the great day of atonement; the sacrifice of the red heifer; the daily sacrifices; the offering of gifts; the divers washings, etc. Indeed, all the more important of the Mosaic institutions are in some way or other indicated; but I will only say that the more fully you consider this branch of the subject, the more deeply will you be convinced that the acceptance of the critical theories must logically lead to the rejection of New Testament authority; and we submit that that is too great a price to pay for the doubtful advantage of being set free from the traditional views of the Old Testament.

II. I pass on to note briefly the bearing of these quotations upon the question of *Individual Authorship*.

1. We saw that Christ assigned the Pentateuch to Moses; so manifestly do the Apostles. All the passages already cited which speak of the 'law of Moses' may be taken as furnishing such proof, since it is undoubtedly not any vague tradition of the law as given through Moses which is meant, but *the* well-known and generally-revered law of Moses as recorded in the pages of the books which bear his name. In addition, we have such passages as the following (Acts iii. 22), 'Moses indeed said, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up,' referring to the eighteenth of Deuteronomy, which, if the Critics are right, would not be what Moses



said, but simply what a writer in the days of Josiah represented him as saying. In the fifteenth of Acts, James, in making known the decision of the Church as to the things binding upon the Gentiles, says, 'For Moses, from generations of old, hath in every city them that preach him, being *read* in the synagogues every Sabbath.' This means more than that Moses and his laws were maintained, or were read about; but Moses himself was preached—the whole system which he under God inaugurated was thus maintained; and it was so through his being *read* every Sabbath, which means nothing less than the customary reading of the Pentateuch. When, in his defence before Agrippa, Paul claims that he has said nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come, it is evident that just as by the 'prophets' he means all the prophetic writings, so by the term 'Moses' he means the Pentateuch as the work of Moses; and in the same sense does he at Rome testify and persuade concerning Jesus both from the *law of Moses* and from the prophets. To deny that the *written law* of Moses is meant by the one phrase must lead to the denial that the *writings of the prophets* are meant by the other. In the tenth chapter of Romans, Paul introduces quotations from Leviticus xviii. 5, and Deuteronomy xxx. 12 and 14, by the statement 'For *Moses writeth*.' Here, then, there is no room for doubting that it is the *written Word* that is meant; and the quotations being from these different portions which the Critics assign to P and D, writers separated by several centuries, stamp the whole as the work of the one man Moses. In the nineteenth verse of the same chapter, Paul, continuing his argument, quotes again from Deuteronomy, this time introducing the quotation by the

phrase '*Moses saith.*' Unquestionably the two expressions 'Moses writeth' and 'Moses saith' mean the same thing, and both point to the book of which he was the author. This last quotation is from the Song of Moses, and it is a portion which has been a sore puzzle to the critics. According to the analytical scheme as given by Dr. Driver, the burden of the authorship is shared as follows: D has written chapters i.—xxvii. 4; then J E supply the fifth and sixth verses of the twenty-seventh chapter, with the first clause of the seventh verse; then D resumes the thread, and gives the second clause of verse 7, and on to the end of the thirtieth chapter. The latter part of the twenty-seventh chapter is, however, held to be inserted in a wrong place out of its proper connection; some part of it (verses 1—8) appears to be based upon an older narrative, which D has expounded and recast. In the remainder, from verses 14—26, divergent and inconsistent representations are given; and either something has been dropped out between verses 13 and 14, or 14—26, must be considered as incorporated from some independent source. Of the thirty-first chapter, verses 1—13 are by D, 14—22 by J E, 23—30 by D. The thirty-second chapter to the forty-fourth verse is by J E, verses 45—47 being by D. Chapter xxxiii. is from an *independent* source. The first clause of the first verse of the thirty-fourth chapter is assigned to P; the second clause, and on to the seventh to D, 'in *the main.*' Verses 8 and 9 are by P; 10 is by J E; and 11 and 12 are by D. That scheme will give you some idea of the ingenuity of the Critics, and also of the confusion which they create where order and simplicity formerly reigned. Complicated as this analysis of Deuteronomy is, it is simplicity itself compared with the divisions

made in some of the other books. Although the scheme assigns the song to J E, there is no very decided opinion given on the point by the Critics; indeed, the fact that J E are put together indicates that it is difficult or impossible to decide which part of it belongs to J, and which was written by E, the one point upon which there is agreement being that *it could not be by Moses*. Now, seeing that the song itself claims to be the composition of Moses, it would require something far more authoritative than the *dicta* of the Critics to set aside that claim; and certainly if more evidence in support of the claim be needed, it is supplied by this quotation of Paul's with the assertion 'Moses saith.' It will serve to show how deliberately and entirely the Critics set aside the testimony of Paul on this point when I mention that a phrase in the very passage which he quotes is fixed upon as deciding the non-Mosaic authorship and late date of the song. Says Paul, 'Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you.' Says Driver, 'The date to which the song is assigned will depend upon the interpretation of the expression "not a people"—probably about 800 B.C.' Once more, in 1 Cor. ix. 9, Paul says, 'It is *written in the law* of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn.' This passage is from the twenty-fifth of Deuteronomy, and thus proves that book to be part of the written law of Moses. It is remarkable how many of the New Testament quotations are from the Book of Deuteronomy—that book which was perhaps the first to be seriously attacked, and the one which has been most severely handled. Driver says, 'Even though it were clear that the first four books of the Pentateuch were written by Moses, it

would be difficult to sustain the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy.' Rather in view of the claim which that book itself makes, and of the way in which it is cited in the New Testament, we should say, 'Even though it were clear that the first four books of the Pentateuch were *not* written by Moses, it would be difficult to sustain the *non-Mosaic* authorship of Deuteronomy.' But we do not need to separate them, and, in spite of all the Critics, we still, with our Lord and His Apostles, maintain the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

2. Several of the passages quoted prove the inspiration of particular Psalms, and of the Book of Psalms as a whole. Notice now a few which assert the *Davidic Authorship* of some. In the second of Acts you remember that Peter not only quotes a large portion of the sixteenth Psalm as what 'David saith,' but he largely founds His arguments upon the fact that *David* was the *author* of the Psalm; showing that the words go far beyond David, and can only be fully realized in David's Lord. The same argument is founded upon the same Psalm by Paul in his address at Antioch, and yet in the face of this Apostolic testimony Canon Cheyne says, 'Certainly no one who thinks that, upon the whole, history is marked by progress rather than degeneracy, can without inconsistency affirm this Psalm to be Davidic. It cannot even be pre-Exilic at all, but is the fruit of that long weaning from the world, begun in Babylonia and perfected under another foreign yoke in Israel's recovered home'! Will it be believed that, while Cheyne tries to combat the arguments of Delitzsch and others in favour of the Davidic authorship, he does not condescend to notice the Apostolic statements at all? Of course the Apostles had

not the critical faculty, and they have no claim to be heard in such a critical discussion! Perhaps it would be well if we left the Critic in the obscurity to which he consigns the Apostles; at any rate, we shall certainly attach as little weight to his opinion as he attaches to the opinion of the Apostles.

Peter, in his address, further quotes from the hundred and tenth Psalm the same passage with which his Lord had confuted the Jews, and, like his Master, he assigns it to *David*. As I before dealt with the Critics' opinion of that Psalm, I say no more about it now.

Sound interpreters have generally attributed the second Psalm to David, albeit it has no title; and we find that they are warranted to do so by Apostolic authority, for in the fourth of Acts, in the prayer of the Church, it is distinctly quoted as the utterance of the Holy Ghost, 'through the mouth of our father David.' It is singular that Cheyne, in speaking of this Psalm, while he thinks that it was written after the Exile, yet considers that the author of it throws himself back into a distant age, and idealizes the reign of Solomon or of David. This almost amounts to a reluctant confession that the internal evidence points to the Davidic authorship. In Romans iv. Paul quotes Psalm xxxii. as David's pronouncement of 'blessing upon the man unto whom God reckoneth righteousness apart from works.' This beautiful production is also declared by Cheyne to be post-Exilic. And this notwithstanding the fact that Paul bases his argument for the antiquity of the doctrine of justification by faith upon the assumed fact that this Psalm depicted *David's* experience and the experience of the godly in David's day. Speaking of Luther's description

of it as a Pauline Psalm, and of Orelli's following in the steps of Luther and Delitzsch in his comment upon it, Dr. Cheyne says, 'I do not yield to Orelli in admiration of this brightest of penitential lyrics. But I cannot at the bidding of a late and uncritical tradition convert a David into a Paul. No . . . the individual is not a self-seeking monarch, but a believer who walks by the soft guidance of Jehovah's eye.' So, then, David is not a believer, but only a self-seeking monarch; this is enlightened criticism with a vengeance. Not only must the New Testament representation of the Davidic authorship of this Psalm be disproved by this criticism, but the consistent description which the New Testament gives of David as a man after God's heart, a man 'who served his own generation by the will of God,' a man through whom the Holy Ghost spake, an earnest, simple-hearted believer in God and His grace, must be utterly falsified, and poor Paul be convicted of holding an uncritical tradition! Once again, Paul, in Romans xi., quotes from the sixty-ninth Psalm, as what 'David saith, Let their table be made a snare,' etc. This, according to Cheyne, belongs to the time of Nehemiah, and refers to the opposition of Sanballat. Even the quality of inspiration in the attenuated sense of the Critics is denied to this Psalm, but, taught by the New Testament, we see in it not only David, but David's Lord, and read it as a solemn God-given prophecy of the overthrow of all our Lord's enemies. I may add that several of these Psalms, as well as several others, are quoted in the Hebrews as what 'God hath said,' but the human author is not mentioned.

3. The book which, after the Pentateuch, has been most ruthlessly attacked by the Critics is the prophecy of *Isaiah*,



and it is the one book which is most frequently cited in the New Testament, and in not a few cases the book is quoted under the name of Isaiah. The four Evangelists unite in stating that the prophecy applied to John the Baptist is from Isaiah the prophet, and it is from the fortieth chapter, the beginning of what the Critics call the second part, the work of the unknown Exilian Isaiah. In the fourth of Matthew, the ninth chapter of the prophecy is quoted as Isaiah's; and, again, in the twelfth of Matthew, that exquisite description of Jesus as Jehovah's servant is quoted from the forty-second chapter. In John xii. 38, the fifty-third chapter is quoted, and, in the next verse the sixth chapter, and both are given as the words of Isaiah the prophet. No divided authorship here! So in the Acts viii. 30, the fifty-third chapter is given as the words of Isaiah, and in the twenty-eighth of the same book Paul cites the sixth chapter of the prophecy under the same name. No divided authorship here! In Romans, Paul cites Isaiah five times by name, besides many quotations which are not so designated, and these are freely taken from both sections. In the ninth chapter, twenty-seventh verse, he quotes the tenth chapter, in the twenty-ninth verse the first chapter, in the tenth chapter, sixteenth verse, he quotes the fifty-third, in the twentieth verse the sixty-fifth, and in the fifteenth chapter, twelfth verse, he quotes the eleventh. All these varied portions were, according to this inspired Apostle, spoken by *Isaiah the prophet*. Certainly he knew nothing of a divided authorship. After such a full and varied testimony, which is to us authoritative, we can afford entirely to disregard the conclusions of the Critics. Several other authors are mentioned by name in the New Testament; Jeremiah, Hosea,

Joel; but as the authorship of these books is not so seriously questioned by the Critics we need not dwell upon them. It is a remarkable fact that the three writers whose authorship is most strenuously disputed by the Critics are the very ones whose names are attached to their writings by the New Testament writers, and their claim to be the authors of the writings which bear their names thereby vindicated, viz., Moses, David, and Isaiah. The other writer who has shared with these three in the Critics' condemnation is Daniel, and, as we have seen, his claim to be the author of the book called by his name is established by the testimony of our Lord.

Brethren, I think this examination, imperfect though it be, of this important subject will be sufficient to show how utterly opposed this Higher Criticism is to the spirit of the New Testament. I think, also, you will easily perceive that however glibly some of these Critics may utter the Evangelical shibboleths and avow their belief in the inspiration of the Bible, they are really by their theories robbing that Word of all inspiration which is worthy of the name. Further, while they assure us that the reception of these theories in no way compromises the Christian faith, it is manifest that the acceptance of them must logically result in the denial of the Inspiration of the New Testament. It is not too much to assume that the attacks upon the New Testament having to a large extent been baffled, the attack prompted by the spirit of opposition to the truth has been transferred to the Old with the view of ultimately discrediting the New. Professing to examine the Old Testament critically, paying attention only to the internal evidence, as they deem it, all external evidence has been set aside, including that furnished by Christ and His Apostles. The result of their

investigations places them in collision with these lofty authorities. The purely rationalistic Critics care nothing for that, or, rather, they are glad that it is so, and use it as an argument against Christianity itself. Those who bear the Christian name, however, must assume a somewhat different attitude. We have seen to what shifts they resort in order to make their theories square with the teaching of Christ, or, rather, to bring His teaching into harmony, or, at least, out of apparent conflict with their theories. Of course, we cannot be satisfied with their explanations of limited knowledge, accommodation, etc., on our Lord's part, but it is interesting to observe that, while they feel it incumbent upon them to disavow the charge of opposing the authority of Christ, they scarcely take the trouble to explain away their opposition to the Apostles. These men of God are treated by them simply as giving expression to the views then prevalent, 'determining the contemporary *Jewish exegesis*.' Then, the gift of inspiration was not sufficient to keep them from error, even of a grave and vital nature; from that it is but a short step to the conclusion that they were not inspired at all. Thus it becomes very clear that the New Testament must stand or fall with the Old, and that if the Critics are right the Apostles are egregiously wrong, and can no longer claim to be authoritative exponents of the Christian faith; and thus what the apologists for the Critics describe as a mere abandonment of some unimportant outpost which is a weakness rather than a strength, will prove to be the surrender to the enemy of the keys of the citadel of the Christian faith. To such surrender, God helping us, we shall be no party, but shall oppose it to the utmost of our power.

## LECTURE VIII.

### THE FACT OF INSPIRATION PREDICATED OF SCRIPTURE—THE FULNESS OF INSPIRATION CLAIMED BY SCRIPTURE.

THE testimony borne to the Inspiration of the Old Testament by Christ and His Apostles ought to be sufficient to convince everyone who acknowledges the authority of Christ that the Old Testament is indeed the Inspired Word of God. While valuing most highly that testimony, we may yet, however, consider other evidence in favour of the conclusion to which we have by that most direct route already been brought. We desire in this and the following lecture to take a general survey of the whole subject of Inspiration, in the course of which, while adverting to some of the matters already considered, we shall look at various other considerations which ought to have great weight, especially the testimony furnished by the Scriptures themselves.

I. Let us notice THE FACT *of Inspiration*. That fact is patent all through. The Bible claims to be in some way a message from God. This will be admitted by many who differ most widely from us as to the nature of that Inspiration.

In many places of the Pentateuch we are assured that God spake to Moses, and through Moses; and much of

it is described by the phrase, 'These are the commandments of the Lord by His servant Moses.' So in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and the historical books generally, we have repeated instances of God speaking. In regard to the prophets, it is sufficient to observe that they constantly represent themselves as speaking by the Spirit of God, delivering the message, the burden of the Lord, 'Thus saith the Lord' being a very common formula. Thus it is clear that much of the contents of the Old Testament is a revelation from God, and that His servants of old were inspired to declare His will. But further, we have not only the fact of the Inspiration of the *men* thus declared, but also the fact of the *Inspiration of the Book* indicated. There are many passages which show that certain portions were committed to writing under Divine direction. Thus in Exodus xvii. 14 Moses is commanded to write an account of the conflict in a book, which might be preserved for the guidance of Joshua. 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua.' From the twentieth to the twenty-fourth of Exodus we have the report of the commandments and directions given by the Lord to Moses, and then in chapter xxiv. 3 it is stated that 'Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments,' manifestly referring to these communications which are recorded in the previous chapters; and, still referring to these, it is added in the fourth verse, 'Moses wrote all the words of the Lord'; and in the seventh verse, 'He took the *book* of the covenant and read in the audience of the people.' Soon, alas! the people broke the covenant; but, upon the intercession of Moses, pardon is granted, and the

Lord calls His servant up to the mount, promising to write again the ten commandments on two tables of stone to replace the ones broken by Moses in his indignation. The thirty-fourth chapter contains the substance of what God said to Moses on that occasion, and concerning that we read in the twenty-seventh verse, 'And the Lord said unto Moses, *Write* thou these words; for after the tenor of these words have I made a covenant with Israel.' Here, by the way, we come upon a curious instance of the ingenuity of the Critics. They are always telling us that in the Pentateuch, and indeed in the Old Testament generally we have several versions of the same story, more or less contradictory, combined by the Redactor. This is one of their instances; they say that in the twentieth of Exodus we have one version of the ten commandments, and in this thirty-fourth chapter we have another, and the two versions are so unlike, that they could not have come from the same pen! It is a marvel how any man could think that this chapter gives a version of the ten commandments. No ordinary reader would ever think so. The chapter itself does not profess to give the commandments. The Critics argue that it does. Why? Because in the first verse the Lord tells Moses that He would write the commandments on the tables of stone; and in the twenty-seventh verse, as already quoted, Moses was to write after the tenor of these words. But if we take the testimony of the chapter itself, it is clear that the contents of the chapter are not the ten commandments, although allusion is made to the first, second, and sixth; for in addition to the direction to Moses to write, we have the distinct statement of the twenty-eighth verse pointing back to the promise of



the first verse, 'And He (*i.e.*, the Lord) wrote upon the tables of stone the words of the covenant, the ten commandments'; the same ten that were written on the first table. Thus the whole account is consistent and harmonious, and we do not need to adopt the absurd conclusion of the Critics that the injunction, 'Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk,' is according to the writer of this portion, one of the fundamental commands of the moral law; while it is also evident, by the reference to the first tables, that the earlier portion is part of the same record, that the whole is a connected account, and not a piece of inartistic patchwork.

The next notice we have of writing is in Numbers xxxiii., where the account of the journeyings of the Israelites in the wilderness is prefaced by the statement, 'And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of the Lord.' And when it is added, 'These are their journeyings,' it manifestly means this is the account written by Moses.

In Deut. xxviii. 58 we find these significant words, 'If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are *written in this book*'; so in the sixty-first verse, 'Every plague which is not *written in the book of this law*'; again, in the twenty-ninth chapter, verses 20, 21, 27, these phrases occur, 'All the curse that is *written in this book*'; 'All the curses of the covenant that is *written in this book*'; and in chapter xxx. 10, 'To keep his commandments and his statutes which are *written in this book of the law*.'

In Deut. xxxi. it is stated, 'Moses wrote this law and delivered it unto the priests'; and the reference is most probably to the whole body of injunctions given in the book. In the nineteenth verse of the same chapter we have the

Divine injunction to Moses, 'Write ye this song for you, and teach thou in the children of Israel,' and in the twenty-second verse, 'So Moses wrote this song the same day, and taught it the children of Israel'; while in the following chapter we have the song given in full. We have the further statement in chapter xxxi. 24, 'And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites which bare the ark of the covenant, of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee.' The phraseology here employed shows very clearly that something more than the Decalogue is meant, and putting this and the others hints together they amount pretty nearly to a claim that the whole Pentateuch was written by Moses, especially when we consider that each of the five books is so closely connected with the others. At any rate, the point we are now pressing is clear—that some parts of the Pentateuch claim to be written by Divine direction.

The Book of Joshua is so closely connected with the Pentateuch, is so manifestly a continuation of the history, and so clearly presupposes the existence of the previous books, that the Higher Critics, to avoid the force of the evidence which it furnishes in favour of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, treat it as part of the whole, which they call the Hexateuch. They thus declare that when at the time of the Exile, according to their theory, the so-called Torah of Moses was compiled out of the various documents by the Redactor, Joshua was part of the complete product. Hence as the Pentateuch is only an ideal picture of Mosaic

legislation, is, indeed, only the laws and customs prevalent at the time of the Exile, codified and by a literary fiction attributed to Moses, so the Book of Joshua is an ideal picture of the times following, and any references therein to the laws of Moses must be treated as part of the fiction—that is to say, the writer of Joshua living centuries after the date of the events, and *knowing* that no book of Moses was in existence in the days of Joshua, nor for 700 years after, nevertheless represents Joshua as having in his possession the Book of the Law of Moses! And we are to be treated as ignorant, and stupid, and uncritical, if we refuse to accept this theory! We prefer to take the Book of Joshua for what it claims to be, a veritable piece of history; and so taking it consider that its reference to the Book of Moses, settles the question as to the existence of that book in those early days. Most emphatic, indeed, is the testimony given in the first chapter: it is full of allusions to the facts and laws of the Pentateuch, and everything is done in accordance with the commandment of the Lord by His servant Moses; while the definite injunction is given, ‘This *book of the law* shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein.’ Thus we have clearly asserted not only the existence of the Pentateuch, but also its Divine authority resting upon the *fact* of its Inspiration. In the eighth chapter, verses 30-35, there is another unmistakable reference to the Book of Moses. Joshua builds the altar not merely as Moses commanded, but as ‘it is *written* in the book of the law of Moses.’ On the stones he writes ‘the words of the law,’ evidently the Ten Commandments, and then he reads ‘all the words of

the law, the blessing and the curse, according to all that is written in the book of the law.' Besides the references to the laws of Moses with which the book teems, we have one more distinct allusion to the book, chapter xxiii. 6, 'Therefore be ye very courageous to keep and to do all that is written in the book of the law of Moses.' Then, in the last chapter it is stated that Joshua wrote these words in the 'book of the law of God,' so that at least part of the contents of the Book of Joshua were written by him, and were invested with authority equal to what had been written by Moses; while it is again clearly indicated that the definite book of the law was in the possession of Joshua, and it is not unreasonable to conclude that he wrote most of the book which bears his name.

Passing by many other allusions to the law of Moses, we note the passage in 1 Sam. x. 25, 'Then Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book.' Here we have not only an indication of Samuel writing some part of the book which bears his name, but, according to the marginal reading of the Revised Version, which is a more correct rendering of our present Hebrew text, a decided reference to the Book of Moses, he 'wrote it in *THE* book,' the well-known book. Indeed, the expression may point not to the Pentateuch alone, but to the Pentateuch with the additions made before the time of Samuel, as we saw that Joshua added his portion to it, so that 'reference is made to a definite Book already in existence, to which Samuel's document was now added, and thus the previous collection increased.'

When Isaiah says, 'Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read,' etc., he is evidently referring to the fact that his

own prophecy would be written, and added to the recognised authoritative book, and could so be proved true in the light of the fulfilment of his prediction. And when in chapter viii. 20, he says, 'To the law and to the testimony! if they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them,' can we doubt that there was a Divinely authoritative collection of Scriptures to which he could thus appeal? In the thirtieth chapter there is the Divine command concerning a particular prophecy, to 'write it before them on a tablet, and inscribe it in a book that it may be for the time to come'; while in several places the book claims to be the record of 'The vision of Isaiah,' 'The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw,' 'The burden (or oracle concerning) Babylon,' 'Moab,' 'Egypt,' etc., 'which Isaiah the son of Amoz did see.'

In the Book of Jeremiah there are frequent intimations of this prophecy being written by Divine command. Thus in the thirty-sixth chapter, 'Take thee a roll of a book and write therein all the words that I have spoken unto thee against Israel, and against Judah from the day I spoke unto thee, from the days of Josiah, even unto this day.' Comparing that with the opening words of the first chapter, it is evident that the injunction covered all the prophecies which Jeremiah had delivered. According to the command the words are written by Baruch the scribe at the dictation of the prophet; then we have the graphic account of the reading of the book before the king, and his scornful treatment of it, cutting it in pieces with his penknife and burning it in the fire; but in the end the word of the Lord comes to Jeremiah, saying, 'Take thee another roll and write in it all the former words that were in the first roll.' This is

done, and 'there were added besides unto them many like words.' That writing remains to us in the Book of Jeremiah, and we are taught the important lesson that though the Word of God may be cut in pieces by infidel or critical penknives, and cast into the fires of criticism, it shall nevertheless survive every attack and remain for the confutation of its enemies and the vindication of its Author.

Again, in chapter xxv. 13, we read, 'And I will bring upon that land all My words which I have pronounced against it, even all that is *written* in *this book*, which Jeremiah hath prophesied against all the nations;' chapter xxx. 2, 'Thus speaketh the Lord, the God of Israel, saying, Write thee all the *words* that I have spoken to thee in a *book*;' chapter li. 60, 'And Jeremiah wrote in a book all the evil that should come upon Babylon, even all these words that are written concerning Babylon.' Putting all these passages together we cannot resist the conclusion that all the prophecies which we now have in the Book of Jeremiah were thus written by the commandment of the Lord. The passages may also serve to indicate the practice of the prophets with regard to the preservation of their messages.

In the same way we find indications of the writing of Ezekiel's prophecies; thus chapter xxiv. 1, 2, 'The word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, write thee the name of the day,' etc.; chapter xliii. 11, 'Make known unto them the form of the house, and the fashion thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the laws thereof, and *write* it in their sight.' That it was the custom for the prophets thus to write their prophecies is further evident from Habakkuk ii. 2,



where the prophet is commanded to '*Write* the vision and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it;' and so in Daniel vii. 1, we read that 'Daniel had a dream and vision of his head upon his bed; then he *wrote* the dream.'

Besides the passages we have already noticed, which refer to the Book of Moses, there are in Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, frequent allusions to what is '*written* in the law of Moses,' 'the *book* of the law of Moses;' but I pass these by, and note that in that remarkable prayer of Daniel, as recorded in chapter ix., we have not only twice mention made of what is 'written in the law of Moses,' verses 11, 13, but also an allusion to what God 'set before us by His servants the prophets.' This we may well take to mean the prophetical books, especially when, in the beginning of the chapter, we find this significant statement, 'I Daniel understood by the books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, for the accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem even seventy years.' By 'the books' must be meant at least the prophetical writings, out of which he specially selected the Book of Jeremiah as giving the most definite note of time. This, taken in connection with his reference to the written law of Moses, ought to prove that in Daniel's day there was a collection of Scriptures including the Torah of Moses and the Books of the Prophets. (Note also the phrase 'Scripture of Truth,' c. x. 21.) Of course, the Higher Critics do not draw the same conclusion as we do. They arbitrarily assume that up to the time of Daniel there was no collection of writings, that the Pentateuch itself had not been written, the Book of Deuteronomy excepted; and then they argue that the fact of the writer of Daniel assuming

the existence of such a collection is one of the proofs that the book was not written by Daniel, nor in Daniel's time, but in the second century B.C. Even on that assumption it is clear that the writer of the book considered that in Daniel's time these Scriptures did exist, for he represents Daniel himself as speaking of them. But we think it far more rational to suppose that the book, or the bulk of it, was written by Daniel, and that it is a true picture of the state of things in his day, than to credit an inspired writer with perpetrating the 'pious fraud' of putting into Daniel's lips references to books that had no existence until many years afterwards. Quite in harmony with the belief that Daniel wrote the book is the injunction given in chapter xii. 4, 'But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book, even to the time of the end.'

In Zech. vii. 12, 'The law' and 'the words which the Lord of hosts had sent by His Spirit by the hand of the former prophets,' are put together as indicating a well-known source of information. It is specially significant that the prophet uses the exact title of two of the divisions of the Jewish Canon, 'The law and the former prophets' (תְּחִלָּה . . . הַנְּבִיאִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים).

In Neh. ix., in the same connection in which 'the commandments, statutes, and a law by the hand of Moses,' are mentioned, we have a reference to the Lord's testifying by His Spirit 'through (or in) the prophets.' We know from the previous chapter that by the law of Moses is meant the *Book* of Moses, and I think that 'in the prophets' refers to the prophetic writings. The expression in the original is 'by the hand of the prophets,' just as in the fourteenth verse the precepts, etc., are 'by the hand of Moses,' and again in

the tenth chapter we read of 'God's law which was given by Moses'—literally, '*by the hand* of Moses': the same phrase occurs in that passage in Zechariah, '*by the hand* of the former prophets.' In the twelfth chapter of Nehemiah there is a reference to the third division of the Canon, which was then in course of formation: the singers were arranged 'according to the commandment of David the man of God,' verse 24; 'according to the commandment of David and of Solomon his son,' verse 45; these commandments being given in Chronicles.

Thus we see that the Old Testament claims that at least a considerable portion of the matter communicated by Divine revelation, was written by inspired men under Divine direction, and from the examination we have made of these passages, we conclude that from the time of Moses onwards there existed a body of writings, which, being increased from time to time by new communications, finally assumed the form of the Jewish Canon—'the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms.' Then, remember, that taking the Gospels simply as history, we saw that Christ accepted as Divinely authoritative the whole of the Old Testament record, under its recognised threefold division, while He also made special use of particular portions. Thus, if we are to consider any part as inspired, we are warranted in considering the whole as inspired, for Christ places all upon the same level, and sets the seal of His authority upon the entire record.

As to the New Testament, surely the fact of Inspiration is patent enough. No one who accepts the Gospels as a true record, can question the fact of the Inspiration of Christ's own utterances. Even His opponents in His own

day admitted that He was a teacher come from God, that 'He spake with authority,' that He spake as 'never man spake.' Coming straight from the source of all revelation, He most undoubtedly had a message from God to men. On the lowest supposition, then, we have in the Gospels the record of His inspired utterances, and even to the report some measure of the Inspiration must attach. But having once accepted the Gospels as histories, on the same grounds as other histories are accepted, we find that Christ promised *Inspiration* to His Apostles, and that they claim to have received the fulfilment of that promise. Now, of course, if we believe that Christ *gave* the promise, we must believe that He fulfilled it; but if He did *not* give it, then the Gospel record which declares that He did give it cannot be true in this particular, and if untrue in one part, we could not be sure of its truth in any part, and so could not have any reliable record of the doings and sayings of Christ at all. But Inspiration being promised and given, we are warranted in regarding the Gospel narratives as written in the exercise of that Inspiration, so that the great revelation which Christ gave in *word* and in *deed* of the Father, is presented to us in these pages with all the authority of Divine Inspiration. Note that in the promise of Christ (Matt. x. 19, 20; Luke xii. 11, 12, xxi. 14, 15; John xvi. 13-15) four things are included. The Spirit was to inspire them to make their defence before the tribunals of their enemies; He was to bring to their remembrance all that Christ had said to them, so that in reciting and recording the facts of Christ's life and teaching, they might not rely upon their own wisdom; He was to guide them into all the truth, to take of the things of Christ and show them

unto them, thus inspiring them to declare to the Church all the grand truths that centre in the person and work of Christ; and He was to show them 'things to come,' so that they might be enabled to make known to the people of God the things that should come to pass in the latter days. Now, with regard to all these matters the record shows that the Spirit did inspire them, not only in their speaking, but also in their writing. It might be objected that the promises of Christ have reference only to their speaking, and that we are not thereby warranted to predicate Inspiration of the writings. It is true that special reference is made to their speaking, more particularly to their making their defence before the tribunals, but the other parts of the promise are more general, and refer to the *communication* of truth in any way, first of all, of course, by speech, but naturally including the subsequent writing. If Inspiration was needed by them in delivering the truth by speech, all the more it was necessary in setting forth that truth in the more permanent form of writing; while it is evident that the written message is in substance identical with the spoken.

In the Acts of the Apostles we find that the Holy Ghost did indeed speak through these men, and in the Epistles they write with authority. John declares that his Gospel was '*written*' that they might believe in the Son of God. Paul, to the Corinthians, declares that the things which he speaks—manifestly referring also, if not specially, to what he was then writing—he speaks 'not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth.' John, in the Revelation, mentions no less than twelve times that he was commanded to write an account of his visions: 'What thou seest, write in a book.'

We have seen how in the exercise of their Inspiration the Apostles treated the whole Old Testament as the inspired Word of God. Their own writings they place on a level with the Old Testament. Thus Peter speaks of Paul writing all his Epistles 'according to the wisdom given unto him,' and asserts that the ignorant and unsteadfast wrest them, 'as they do also *the other Scriptures*, unto their own destruction.' Again, in 2 Pet. iii. 1, 2, he claims authority for his own Epistle (as also in the first chapter), and bids them remember the *words* which were spoken hefore by the holy *prophets*, and the *commandment* of the Lord and Saviour *through your Apostles*.' (See also Jude 17.) Paul charges the Thessalonians that his 'Epistle be read unto all the brethren'; bids them hold the traditions which they had been taught (the truths *delivered* to them), whether by word or by his Epistle, and denounces the man who should refuse to obey his word by his Epistle. To the Corinthians he says, 'If any man think himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things which I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.' In 1 Tim. v. 18, a passage is quoted from Luke's Gospel as of equal authority with Deuteronomy, 'For the *Scripture* saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn,' and 'The labourer is worthy of his hire,' the latter being the words of the Lord Jesus as recorded by the Evangelist. Remember, these passages given are only a specimen of the authoritative style of the New Testament; the writers of it speak as men who are in the secret of the Lord, and are overshadowed by His authority.

The Book as a whole, consisting of the Old and New Testaments, assuredly and unmistakably lays claim to the



possession of Inspiration, and that claim is fully borne out by the character of its contents.

There are many points in proof which we can only mention. 1. *Its marvellous unity*. You have in the Bible sixty-six different treatises, written by different men, in different circumstances, at different times, in different styles, even in different languages, and yet all perfectly harmonious. The only explanation of such harmony amid such manifold diversity is that one Spirit dominated all the writers and moulded into one the diverse writings.

2. Consider, too, the *sublime conceptions of God* which the Bible contains; conceptions by the side of which the guesses of the wisest men are puerile and fantastic; conceptions which could only come from God Himself, yet withal couched in language of the most charming simplicity. The opening declaration of Genesis, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,' immeasurably transcends all the speculations of ancient philosophers; and all the notes that are sounded throughout the Word are in perfect harmony with the keynote struck in that opening verse, and the final hallelujahs of the Apocalypse seem but the echoes of the same lofty strains, 'Great and marvellous are Thy works, O Lord God, the Almighty; righteous and true are Thy ways, Thou King of the ages.'

3. *Its lofty morality*. This is a growth from no human soil. It is a tree of the Lord's own planting. Compared with all other ancient books as to morality how glorious it appears! Yea, comparison at once passes into contrast. There is none like it. There is never any attempt to paint its heroes better than they are; their faults are as clearly indicated as their virtues. The writers never seek to con-

ceal their own failings. Such impartiality is unparalleled in the whole circle of ancient literature. A short and decisive argument for the truth of the Bible is founded on its morality thus—It must either have been written by bad men or good men; but bad men would not have written that which condemns themselves; and good men would not deceive; and so we conclude that good men wrote it, and, according to their own testimony, wrote it by Inspiration of God.

4. *The fulfilment of its prophecies* is one of the strongest proofs, but upon that it is not needful to utter one word. Men may try to make out that many of the prophecies were written after the event, but even the most sceptical must admit that the bulk of the prophecies have been fulfilled since the book as a whole was written. Babylon and Nineveh, Egypt and Asia Minor, Jerusalem and Capernaum, Tyre and Sidon, with a host of other names, call up to-day to our minds scenes which will ever furnish an impressive commentary upon the prophetic Word, and through all time bear witness to its Inspiration.

5. *Its unique portraiture of the Lord Jesus Christ* is one of the most powerful arguments for its Divinity. That portrait as outlined in prophecy is sufficiently marvellous, and the actual representation of the life of Christ given in the New Testament transcends all human conceptions. The Inspiration of the Spirit of God can alone account for the *preview* which the prophets had of Christ. The actual manifestation of that life can alone account for the Evangelists' narrative. Human genius was powerless to invent such a life. To suppose that their narrative was the product of their own genius and imagination would imply a greater miracle than any which they narrate.

6. Its *peculiar doctrines* may well be considered as proofs of its Divine origin. Such doctrines as the Trinity, Election, Atonement, Regeneration, Justification by Faith, etc., *as they are set forth* in the Scriptures, cannot be the fruit of mere human reason. That of some of these, men without the Bible revelation have had glimmerings, we may admit, but their full-orbed beauty, as they shine in the Scriptures of truth, had never gladdened the unaided vision of man.

7. Then, in addition to all these and other unmentioned proofs, you have the *moral and spiritual effects of the Bible* wherever believed. Throughout the ages the Gospel has been supplying its own evidence; it has ever been attested by 'signs following.' The tendency of Bible knowledge has always been to make men better. To-day the lands that are highest in the scale of civilization are those where the Bible is best known. And so long as that Word has power to charm and to change men, so long as we can point to such transformation scenes as have been in our own day effected among the Telugus and in the New Hebrides, so long will it be impossible to deny that the Bible is from God, that its Divine Inspiration is a *grand fact*.

II. We now briefly note THE FULNESS OF INSPIRATION. We believe that the Inspiration is so full that it extends to the language as well as to the thoughts—in other words, *Plenary and Verbal Inspiration*. This is a matter that can only be proved by the Scriptures themselves, and just as we examine the Scripture testimony on any doctrine such as Election, Atonement, and Regeneration, so do we ask, What saith the Scripture regarding the *extent* or *fulness* of Inspiration? Upon this point the Scriptures give no uncertain sound. There is a whole host of passages bearing upon it, but after what we

have formerly considered a mere selection will suffice. Thus to Moses, God says, 'Now therefore go and I will be with thy *mouth* and teach thee *what* thou shalt say . . . and thou shalt *speak* with him (Aaron) and put *words* in his *mouth* and I will be with thy *mouth*, and with his mouth and will teach you what ye shall do.' Says David, 'The Spirit of the Lord *spake* by me and *His word* was on my tongue.' To Isaiah, God says, 'I have put My *word* in thy mouth.' Jeremiah says, 'Then the Lord put forth His hand and touched my mouth, and the Lord said unto me, Behold I have put My *words* in thy mouth;' and to Ezekiel the injunction is given, 'Thou shalt speak My *words* unto them.' Then, remember how often you meet with such phrases as 'The mouth of the Lord hath *spoken* it,' 'The *word* of the Lord came unto me,' 'Thus *saith* the Lord,' 'Hear the *word* of the Lord.' These and kindred passages clearly prove that, as far as the Old Testament writers are concerned, in many cases the *very words* were given or suggested; and, as many of these messages are recorded in the Book, it is clear that at least some portions of it are *Verbally* Inspired. Then, if you will look at the passages quoted in the former part of this lecture, you will see that Moses, Jeremiah, and others, wrote the *very words*, according to Divine direction; indeed, all the injunctions about writing must, more or less, concern the *words*. But, again, we have to remember that Christ and His Apostles place all the Old Testament writings on the same level and treat them as of equal authority. 'The Lord *spake* by His servant Moses' can be said of all the Pentateuch. The writings of the prophets are 'those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all His prophets.' When

Peter, in his Second Epistle, refers to the whole Old Testament Canon as 'the prophetic word'; he says of it, 'No prophecy of Scripture' (taking prophecy in its broad Scriptural meaning, as not merely a prediction of future events, but any message from God) 'is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the *will* of man; but men *spake* from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost.' This statement agrees with the others quoted in attributing inspiration to the very words. It is not that holy men *thought* as they were moved by the Spirit, but they *spake*; the *ideas* were not only Spirit-given, but the *verbal expression* was under the direction of the same Spirit. So in that other important passage in 1 Peter, the prophets are represented as earnestly examining their own prophecies to find out the meaning of their own words; proving conclusively that they never could have accurately expressed the Spirit-given thought, had the same Spirit not aided them in the selection of the words as well; for it is a well-known principle that what a man does not clearly understand he cannot clearly express; so these prophets, *left to themselves*, could not have chosen words which could clearly and fully set forth the Divine thought in their mind, which they did not understand. We saw how Christ and His Apostles founded important arguments upon single phrases and words, and upon tenses, numbers and persons of verbs, which would be building upon sand were the very words not inspired.

As to the Inspiration of the New Testament, it is equally clear that it extended to the words. In their defence before the authorities the very *words* they had to speak were to be given to the Apostles. He was to give them a *mouth* and *wisdom—word* and *thought*; they were not to consider

*how* or *what* they should speak, for it should be given them; again, the form and the substance must be understood by the *how* and the *what*. The disciples who, on the Day of Pentecost, 'began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance,' must undoubtedly have had the words of the *unknown* tongues, as well as the thoughts, given to them. Paul describes the inspiration with which he was favoured in that passage of 1 Cor. ii. 13, which I need not again quote; but surely he indicates *Verbal* Inspiration. He speaks of the *things* that are given him of God, the *thoughts* of God, the *substance* of his message, and the *words* in which he utters these things or thoughts. The *words* are taught by the Holy Ghost as certainly as the *thoughts*. It is asserted by some that this passage does not support the idea of Verbal Inspiration because the Greek word λόγος here used means 'discourse,' or 'speech,' and it is suggested that if the 'words' had been meant ῥῆμα would have been used. We might say of this that in some of the other passages we have considered it is ῥῆμα that is used, and, further, that λόγος, while meaning a discourse, also means a word in the strictest sense, and is used as equivalent to ῥῆμα (e.g., 1 Cor. xiv. 19); but even taking λόγος as meaning discourse or speech, how is the case altered? A discourse is made up of words, and if a discourse is to be fully inspired, the *words* must partake of the inspiration. How else can a discourse, apart from the thought contained in it, be inspired unless through the words being inspired? If the parts partake not of the quality of inspiration, how can the whole be affected by it? Regarding this as Paul's description of inspiration, we can apply it to the whole of Scripture, which he tells us is



'given by inspiration of God' (Θεόπνευστος, God-breathed). Mark in that passage in 2 Tim. iii. 16 he speaks not simply of the *thoughts* or substance of the Scriptures as being inspired, but the *Scripture itself*, the sacred letters (τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα). It does not matter which rendering we adopt, 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable,' or 'Every Scripture given by inspiration is also profitable.' In either case the reference to the canonical books is fixed by the previous mention of the 'sacred letters.' The Apostle John manifestly claims Inspiration for the very words of the Apocalypse, as the following passages prove: Rev. i. 3, 'Blessed is he that readeth and they that hear the *words* of this prophecy'; the repeated injunctions in the second and third chapters to *write* to the angel of the Church; Rev. xxi. 5, '*Write*, for these *words* are faithful and true'; xxii. 6, 'These *words* are faithful and true'; verse 7, 'Blessed is he that keepeth the *words* of this book'; verse 9, 'Which keep the *words* of this book'; verses 18, 19, 'I testify unto every man that heareth the *words* of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues which are *written* in this *book*; and if any man shall take away from the *words* of the *book* of this prophecy, God shall take away his part,' etc. Surely no language could more solemnly convey to us the immense importance which God attaches to the very *words* of Scripture.

Mark, too, that in many of the passages quoted, Inspiration is predicated of the Scripture, the *writing*; but if the very writing be inspired, what is that but Verbal Inspiration, since the writing is made up of *words*? This is also implied in all the other titles given to the Scriptures: the *Word*

of God, the *Oracles* of God, the *Law* and the *Testimony*; in each the verbal expression is made prominent.

I should like, further, to show that the *fulness* of Inspiration involves the surcharging of ordinary words with a deeper, richer meaning, so that you can have what is known as the 'double sense of prophecy,' the manifold application of Scripture, but I forbear to enter upon that, though it is a thought that would bear elaboration.

Other considerations regarding the Inspiration of the words I shall notice in our next lecture; meanwhile, I close this by a brief reference to the metaphysical bearing of the question. For us it is enough that the Scriptures do teach that they are inspired even in the language; but it is interesting to know that this doctrine is in harmony with sound philosophy. In view of the disputations among metaphysicians as to whether the operation of thought is or is not possible apart from language (taking language in the general sense, as including signs as well as words), we may hesitate to pronounce dogmatically; but the following quotations will show that Dr. Hodge has good reason for saying, 'Men think in words.' Reid says, 'Language is the express image and picture of human thought.' Whately says, 'Language affords the signs by which the operations of the mind are not only expressed and communicated to others, but even, for the most part, carried on by ourselves.' Sir William Hamilton, who contended that language was not essential to thought, yet says, 'It must be admitted that we could never have risen above the very lowest degrees in the scale of thought without the aid of signs; a sign is necessary to give stability to our intellectual progress, words are fortresses of thought.' 'Admitting even that the mind is

capable of certain elementary concepts without the fixation or signature of language, still these are but sparks that would twinkle only to expire.' 'So far signs are necessary for the internal operation of thought itself.' Thomson, who also believes in the independence of thought over language, says, 'As we are now constituted, our thoughts are invariably clothed in speech. We use words even if we do not utter them.' Mansel says, 'Language in this sense' (*i.e.*, including signs as well as words)' appears, as far as experience can inform us, to be necessary not only to the communication of thought, but to the formation of thought.' And Fowler says, 'Practically we do always think by means of language.' It is thus admitted on all hands that there is an intimate and inseparable connection between thought and language. So intimate is that connection that it seems hard to understand how the thought could be inspired without the inspiration being extended to the language; and what a study of the human mind would warrant us to expect, that the Scripture shows to be the case when it claims so emphatically to be, both as to thought and word, given by Inspiration of God.

## LECTURE IX.

### THE FORM OF THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION WARRANTED BY SCRIPTURE.

GOD spake unto 'the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners.' This statement is fully confirmed by an examination of the Book itself. Sometimes God spake to His servants by a direct voice, sometimes by visions, sometimes by dreams, sometimes by suggestion and intuition; but in all these varied forms it was God who spake; it was a Divine message that reached the heart of the inspired man. And the *Form of the Product* of Inspiration is just as various as the fact itself. We find it in the form of History, Biography, Prediction, Psalm, Parable, Moral Discourse, Maxims and Proverbs. But however varied the form, the essence is the same, and the whole Book is the voice of God to us. No theory of Inspiration can be complete which does not take account of all the facts. In considering the form of the doctrine or theory of Inspiration which we hold as warranted by Scripture, and sufficient to account for all the phenomena of Scripture, a passing word concerning other theories may not be out of place.

• There is, first, *the Naturalistic Theory*. According to this

theory, the Inspiration of the sacred writers does not differ in kind from the inspiration of genius. Some have called it the theory of *Ordinary* inspiration, and both epithets imply that the holders of it do not admit that the writers of Scripture were under any supernatural influence; at least, to no greater extent than the ordinary Christian. According to this theory, in some of its phases the Scripture is only the Word of God in so far as it finds a response in our consciousness; the writers are but reporters of what they witnessed—truthful, honest, but yet fallible reporters. It seems that Dr. Horton's view is but a phase of this theory, viz., that inspiration attaches to the facts recorded, not to the record of the facts. It is enough to observe that the naturalistic theory is entirely opposed to all those passages we have cited wherein a direct supernatural influence upon the writers is distinctly indicated.

2. Another theory may be called the *Intermittent Theory*. It is generally known as the theory of Degrees of Inspiration. Canon Farrar prefers to call it the Illumination theory, cogently observing that Illumination may be intermittent, but Inspiration must be continuous. Those who hold it speak of the Inspiration of 'superintendence,' of 'elevation,' of 'direction,' of 'suggestion.' There is a way of holding this theory which would make it practically equivalent to the Plenary view; but more generally it implies that in parts of Scripture the inspiration is of a very low degree, if perceptible at all. Our great objection to the theory, in its best aspect, is that Scripture gives no countenance to it. In all the passages we have considered, there is no hint of different degrees of Inspiration; while in practice it would leave the individual the difficult, if not

impossible, task of deciding which portions were perfectly, and which imperfectly, inspired.

3. *The Partial Theory* is held by many, and is sometimes called the theory of *Essential* Inspiration. According to it only certain parts of the Bible are inspired. The Bible is not the Word of God, but it *contains* the Word of God. The Inspiration is confined 'to matters of doctrine, matters of morality, and, above all, matters of faith.' This, in our view, utterly fails to meet the facts of the case. It seems quite inconsistent with the Scripture testimony we have been considering, while it practically fails to show us what parts are really inspired; for one of the features of the Scripture revelation is that matters of doctrine, of morality, of faith, are so imbedded in the historical, biographical, descriptive parts, that we cannot consistently attribute Inspiration to the one element and deny it to the other.

4. *The Mechanical or Organic Theory*—or, as it is sometimes called, the *Dictation* Theory—has very often been confounded with the theory which we hold. It asserts that every word and syllable were dictated by the Holy Ghost, the writers being the pens in His hand, His amanuenses. Although this is certainly *Verbal* Inspiration in the fullest possible sense, and although the theory admittedly explains satisfactorily many portions of the Word, yet it cannot well be applied to all parts, and its great defect is that it does not sufficiently recognise the human element. Gaussen has by some been credited with holding this theory; but although he sometimes does employ the word 'dictation' as if he applied it to the whole Scriptures, yet I think that, rightly understood, he ought rather to be considered an advocate



of the next theory I notice, which is also the one we hold—viz.:

§ 5. THE DYNAMICAL THEORY, or, as it is often called, *Plenary* Inspiration; or, as we sometimes more fully and exactly term it, the theory of *Plenary and Verbal Inspiration*.

The simple meaning of the word ‘plenary’ is, of course, ‘full,’ and the one word ought to be enough to describe our view of Inspiration; for if the Inspiration is really ‘full,’ it must extend to the *words*, and so be also *verbal*. Inasmuch, however, as some claim that the term may be applied to some of the other theories, in the sense of describing the Inspiration as *sufficient*, although not pertaining to the language, we feel that it is better, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, to speak of Plenary and Verbal Inspiration. Still, we do not hesitate to use either ‘plenary’ or ‘verbal’ as, to our minds, expressive of the same idea. While, in accordance with custom, calling this a theory of Inspiration, we are more disposed to consider it as the *doctrine* of Inspiration. When we say that it is Plenary and Verbal, we are making a simple deduction from the facts which have come before us; we are only affirming, in accord with Scripture evidence, that the Inspiration given to the Sacred writers, and embodied in their writings, was of the fullest kind, reaching even to the expression of their thoughts, as well as to the thoughts themselves. Two years ago I ventured to state my view of the doctrine, and, as I cannot better express it now, I repeat the statement: ‘We believe in the Plenary and Verbal Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures—that is to say, we believe that the writers of the various portions were so influenced by the Spirit of God

that they were led to record those truths which God wished to be handed down in language which God Himself approved; so that the narrative is Inspired in every part—is an authentic, authoritative, and infallibly accurate record of all the facts of which it treats, whether these be facts of revelation supernaturally communicated, or facts of history, biography, observation, and experience which lay within the ken of the writer, or could be acquired by the use of natural means. We consider this a fair statement of the theory of Inspiration which is held by most Evangelical Christians, sometimes called Plenary, sometimes Verbal, and sometimes Plenary and Verbal Inspiration. What is undoubtedly meant by those who use these terms is that the Inspiration granted to the sacred writers was full and sufficient for the purpose of correctly conveying God's will to men—extending to the thoughts and the words, and making the whole product of their pens the veritable Word of the Living God.' We have used the word '*dynamical*' in describing this view, which indicates that there was a *δύναμις*—a supernatural power in the writers moving and guiding them. There has been a disposition of late in certain quarters to apply this word to several of the other theories we have noticed, and, of course, any theory which admits the working of the supernatural in the writer may be called '*dynamical*' to a greater or less extent; but writers of various schools having agreed to describe the Plenary Theory as, in a special sense, the '*dynamical*,' we are justified in still claiming it. The main use of the word, however, is to distinguish ours from the so-called *Mechanical* Theory. That theory, in predicating *dictation* of the whole Book, professes to give an explanation of the *how* of Inspiration,

which we submit is beyond our grasp. It also fails to take due account of the human element. Our theory deals only with the facts of Inspiration, and does not pretend to unfold the mystery of the Spirit's operations; and while recognising in the fullest measure the presence of the Divine element, it also gives the right place to the human element, treating the writers, as someone has said, not as 'pens,' but as *pen-men* of the Spirit. Yet, unfortunately, the idea of *Verbal* Inspiration has so often been associated with dictation, that as soon as it is mentioned, it is in many quarters at once branded as '*mechanical*,' and that hard word is made to do duty for argument—indeed, it is thought there is no need for arguing with us or considering our belief. We repudiate as strongly as any the idea of '*mechanical*' in this connection; our theory, while giving free course to the Spirit of God, allows the most unfettered action to the spirit of man. In view of this misconception of our position, let me state more fully what we understand of the nature of Inspiration as dynamical and not mechanical. In passing, I may remark that it would be hard to deny that in some portions of the Word there is even to be found '*dictation*,' and perhaps those who hold that theory as a whole might retort upon their Critics that there is nothing more '*mechanical*' in having the words dictated than in having the thoughts imparted.

It is not always quite clear what is meant by the epithet '*mechanical*' as some use it; but I suppose that generally, as we have indicated, those who use it mean that the theory so characterized gives no place to the human element—makes the man a mere machine, wrought upon by the Spirit; but not himself consciously acting, being, indeed, as

passive in the hand of the Spirit as the pen in the hand of a writer—so passive that he is not in any sense responsible for his utterances. We have already said enough to show that we do not share such a belief. That caricature is more like the pagan idea of Inspiration. When a heathen prophet professed to be inspired, he was in a deranged state; he lost all control of his faculties—was, as it were, taken out of himself. So in Virgil's description of the Cumæan Sybil as possessed by Apollo, her countenance and colour change, her hair escapes from its band, her bosom swells high as in a frenzy, her voice seems not to be human, and, altogether, she is like a madwoman. So Apuleius, speaking of a certain soothsayer, says he 'behaved himself like a raging madman, and breathing all the while most deeply from his inmost bosom, as though over-full of the Divine spirit, feigned sickly nonsense, just as if, through the presence of the gods, men were not rendered better than they were before, but as though they were thereby made weak and sick.' The Greek word *μάντις* (*mantis*), descriptive of such prophets, is by Plato considered to be derived from *μαίνομαι* (*mainomai*, to rage, to be mad), and to mean one who 'uttered oracles in a state of Divine frenzy.' But far otherwise is the Bible idea of Inspiration. 'Holy men of old spake as they were moved (*Φερόμενοι*, carried, borne along) by the Holy Ghost;' but they were not carried out of themselves—their own faculties were not suspended; they did not lose control of themselves. Their whole conduct shows that, even when directly claiming to be speaking by the Spirit of God, their means were clear, calm, and collected—they could reason, instruct, warn, and plead as the circumstances demanded; and, while speaking with Divine authority, were, in the

truest sense, human messengers, each being most clearly *compos mentis*. 'The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets' is the statement of Paul, and it contains profound psychological and physiological instruction upon the *modus operandi* of the Divine Spirit in His contact with the human soul. Thus Chrysostom elaborates it, 'This is the peculiarity of the *mantis*, to be beside one's self, to suffer constraint, to be struck, to be stretched, to be dragged like a madman. The prophet is not so, but he speaks everything with calm understanding, and with sound self-possession, and knowing what he proclaims, so that before the result, we can even from these things distinguish between the *mantis* and the prophet.' This is what we believe; and since the theory leaves the speaker or writer perfectly free and in full possession and use of all his faculties even under the Divine *Afflatus*, we deny that it is open to the charge of being mechanical. So far from making the man a machine and preventing him from using his natural powers, it makes these powers more efficient, and gives the man the fullest command over them. The human element is allowed full scope—every writer follows the bent of his own genius; so that we have that marvellous variety of style and treatment which has ever been reckoned one of the greatest literary charms of the Bible; and instead of being an objection against the theory of Plenary Inspiration, this variety is indeed a necessary consequence of that theory rightly understood.

There is no more reason in calling this particular theory 'mechanical,' than in so describing the 'illumination' theory which, in some of its phases, allows of as full an influence of the Spirit of God; the 'partial,' or 'essential'

theory which, in regard to those portions considered inspired, premises the same influence; or, indeed, any theory which really admits the operation of the Divine Spirit in any supernatural sense. Unless, then, the direct action of the Spirit of God upon the soul of man necessarily involves the reduction of the man to a machine, the epithet, as applied to Plenary Inspiration, is a misnomer. We do not profess to explain *how* the spirit could exercise supreme control, and yet leave the human agent perfectly free. There is a difficulty which we have no desire to shirk; it arises solely from the presence of the supernatural. Difficulties generally gather round the *how* of such matters. The *fact* may be plain enough, and yet the *how* be wrapped in impenetrable mystery. The phenomena of life may be seen by all; but there is a mystery about the *how* of existence, even in its lowliest forms, that all the power of science fails to solve. We believe, and are not surprised to find, that mystery surrounds all the operations of the Spirit of God. In Regeneration, no one can tell how the Infinite Spirit comes into contact with the finite. Our Lord recognises the mystery: He distinctly abstains from explaining it. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth,' etc., so we believe it is in Inspiration. It has often been urged against the Evangelical doctrine of Regeneration that it makes a man a machine; but Orthodox Christianity has ever repudiated the charge, and held that while the sovereign Spirit works as He will, the free-agency of man remains unimpaired. Every objection against the Divine operation upon the soul in Inspiration would lie with equal force against Regeneration. Those who eliminate the supernatural element from Inspiration may get rid of some difficulty; but in so doing,



they create greater difficulties than those they seek to remove. The Christian Church, based as it is upon the supernatural, cannot afford to ignore that element, nor will the difficulty of explaining all the phenomena of Inspiration be any reason for rejecting the doctrine, while we hold fast the faith of Evangelical Christendom, as expressed in the old words, '*I believe in the Holy Ghost.*'

Thus we hold that our theory meets all the requirements of the case. It affirms that to the writer there was given such a measure of the Spirit of God that he was entirely influenced and controlled thereby, so that all that he wrote had the Divine stamp upon it; while, at the same time, he was left in the free exercise of all his faculties, and was allowed to write according to his own style, in harmony with his own environments, and in words drawn from his own vocabulary. Thus we take full account of the human element in the Bible, and of the variety resulting therefrom. Some there are who seem to ignore the human element altogether, while others, alas! deny the Divine element, and treat the whole thing as a human growth, the product of human thought and experience. The *via media* is here, as elsewhere, the safe course. I believe that the Spirit of God wrought in the men in such a way that the writings may be considered as much the work of the men as if they had had no help from God, while they are also as much the work of God as if He had made no use of the human instrument. In this Word the Divine and human are most beautifully blended, so that no one can say, 'Here the human ends and the Divine begins'; or, 'Here the Divine disappears and the human shows itself.' There is some analogy to this, perhaps, in the Incarnate Word. Christ

was so thoroughly man and so perfectly God, that you cannot separate the two natures. He was as really human as if no Divine element had place in Him. He was as truly Divine as if He had no vestige of humanity. And as it has been said of Christ, that His *humanity* proves His Divinity, so might we say of the Bible, that its humanity proves its Divinity. God meant His Book for men, and hence we expect that it will be of such a nature as to come home to the thoughts and feelings and experience of men. Even some of the more trivial incidents recorded in the Bible will be found to have a justification for their presence. For instance, I have heard the incident of Jacob's kissing Rachel spoken of as unworthy of a place in a Divine book, and as certainly not requiring Inspiration for the recording of it. Now, it must be remembered that this incident is simply a part of the general history of Jacob, and the truthfulness of history comes out most fully in its *details*, and therein also lies much of its value. A very large portion of the Word of God is given in the form of history; the history of God's ancient people in the Old Testament, and in the New, the history of the life and death of the Lord Himself; so that we may verily say the most important part of the Word of God is its history. Christianity is emphatically historical; and it is just because it has its roots in actual history that it is so vital and so precious. But history must necessarily have much that is human in it, and, coming back to the incident mentioned, I think the insertion of it in no way detracts from the Inspiration of the Book, but, looked at closely, may even tend to confirm it. Anyone writing the book of Genesis intending to palm it off as the Word of God would have refrained from mentioning

such a circumstance; but the writer, led by his inspiration to give it place, seems altogether unconscious of there being anything derogatory in the mention of it, any more than the Evangelist John thinks the account of Christ attending the marriage of Cana beneath the dignity of his spiritual narrative. He states it as a fact that has a natural place in the story, and that, perhaps, had an important bearing upon other facts. And, trivial as it may seem, it is full of humanity, and strikes a chord in the heart of most human beings.

In considering the form or manner of Inspiration, in order to account satisfactorily for all the phenomena of Scripture, it is necessary, in conjunction with the dynamical theory, to bear in mind the distinction between Revelation and Inspiration as explaining certain matters, which otherwise would prove stumbling-blocks. On this point I content myself with quoting from my pamphlet on 'Verbal Inspiration':

'Questions are often asked as to degrees of Inspiration. Was as much Inspiration needed to record apparently trivial and well-known historical facts as to make known a doctrine of the Gospel? Are we to consider the speeches of Sennacherib's general, the edict of Darius, the letter of Claudius Lysias, as much inspired and as really the Word of God, as the Sermon on the Mount or the Epistle to the Romans? Here, I think, some distinction is necessary. While believing that the whole of the Bible is the Word of God, I do not see that every part of it is the Word of God in exactly the same sense. The *lie* of the serpent, "Ye shall not surely die," cannot be the Word of God in the same sense as the Divine threat, its very opposite, is.

I think the clue is to be found in the distinction between Inspiration and Revelation. We regard the Bible as an Inspired record of facts—facts of history, facts of experience, facts of revelation. The sacred writers were inspired to relate these facts in the way in which they have related them, but the nature of the fact determines its value. In recording well-known facts of history, in reporting what others had said, it was only necessary that the writers should be preserved from error; that they should be guided what to insert, and what to leave out. In reporting truths before unknown, they had, we conceive, just the *same* Inspiration; the difference lay in the fact that these truths were revealed to them direct before they could report them. As in erecting a house a builder might direct his men to make use of some old materials which were lying by and to reject others, while for the greater part of the building he provides new material, each part would go to make up the structure and would be in the same sense built; so the writers of Scripture are directed to take materials already within their reach, and they are furnished with much that was before unknown, but the whole goes to make up the Scriptural structure, and is in the *same sense inspired*. To use another illustration—take up, for instance, Gibbon's great historical work. You find that necessarily the bulk of the work is founded on other historical documents. He condenses, amplifies, sifts, and systematizes these in his own way, expressing their statements in his own language, according to his own judgment. Sometimes, however, he quotes entire passages of important documents, while throughout he is constantly giving his own independent reflections upon the events narrated, yet we rightly call the

whole alike "Gibbon's History." We do not say this part was specially written and that was otherwise written. It is all the work of his genius which shows itself as really in the skilful incorporation of old matter as in the utterance of philosophical sentiments. Instead of the spirit or genius of a Gibbon, think of the Spirit of God. Why should not that Spirit in the mind of a man, or different men, lead them to present formerly-known facts in a new way, quote special documents or sayings, and bring to light entirely new truths? As the history produced with all its variations, under the direction of Gibbon's genius, is his history, so the Bible, with all its marvellous diversity, produced as it is under the guidance of the Spirit of God, is emphatically the Book of God. If the distinction between Inspiration and Revelation is kept in mind, it will preserve the subject from some of the difficulties which have been suggested; as, for instance, not long ago, a noted Doctor of Divinity declared that the presence of some of the devil's sayings in the Book of Job made it impossible for him to believe in what he called "verbal dictation," though he evidently meant "Plenary Inspiration." But the presence of such sayings is clearly, on the explanation given, not inconsistent with the true plenary theory. The fact that such sayings are reported, and reported by Inspiration, so that we have a true *record* of them, does not make the lie a truth, nor invest it with Divine authority. Inspiration, then, we apply to the *record* itself, Revelation to the *communication of new truth to the mind of the seer*. Regarding the Bible as a whole, we say it is the Word of God, as a record *inspired in every detail*, but every part is not of the same *intrinsic* value. Unless there was Inspiration in the act of writing, we could

at best have a human record of the Divine Revelation; while on the supposition that the thoughts of God, in some way unknown to metaphysicians, reached the prophet's mind, and were by him clothed in words, we have a human record of a human conception of a Divine Revelation; and in the cases where the writer is a different person from the one receiving the revelation, we might only have a human and fallible record of a human recollection of a human tradition, of a human recollection of a human conception of a Divine revelation. As that is a legitimate inference from some of the theories which, instead of the old plenary view, seek our suffrages, we say emphatically, "*The old is better.*"

I may add that even the statements attributed to Satan may have been conveyed to the mind of the writer by revelation, as, for instance, those uttered in the temptation scene in Eden, and also those given in the account of our Lord's temptation. As to the latter, it is certain that none of the disciples were with Christ, so that what Satan said must either have been communicated, revealed to them by Christ, or by the Holy Spirit afterwards; but, even so, the words were conveyed to their minds, not as containing the truth of God, but the thoughts of the devil. Again, it is worth noting that while there might be Inspiration granted to writers who received no revelations, as, for instance, the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, so there might be revelations granted to one who was not inspired to record them, as, for instance, Abraham. But for one to be an authoritative exponent of the Divine will, it was necessary not only to have the truth revealed to his mind, but to have the Spirit of God guiding his utterance, whether oral or written: and



it is noteworthy that even Christ, the 'Teacher come from God,' to whom all truth lay open, was yet anointed with the Spirit for His prophetic work, and under the guidance of that Spirit declared the truth of God.

In view of the distinction between Revelation and Inspiration, it is perhaps easier to see how the purely historical portions can be inspired, and even Verbally Inspired. If we believe that the Spirit of God in the writers directed them in the choice of their material, in the weaving together of facts, in the presentation of the historical matter in the form in which it left their pens, then we can believe that the whole language was approved by that Spirit, that His sacred influence extended to every part of it. May I here add another quotation from my paper on this point, although it may have been to some extent anticipated by a former paragraph: 'We are not surprised at the ground-work of plain history which we find in the beautiful fabric of Scripture. History is the life of men, and will always possess interest for them, and a history which shows us God in contact with the life of men must have special significance. Why should not the record of God's revealing Himself in the lives of men be as really Inspired as the record of His revelation of Himself to the mind of any seer? As a history, compare the Bible with any of the so-called "Sacred Books of the East," and how conspicuously does its superiority appear! Compare it with other ancient stories—the mythological lore of Greece and Rome, the monumental records of Egypt, Babylon, and Assyria, and explain how it is that the sacred penmen, writing of so much that was mysterious and supernatural, exposed to the temptations to which writers of mythology

have always yielded, should yet preserve their narratives *entirely free* from the fantastic puerilities and absurd incongruities with which these other scribes have embellished their stories! On first looking at the simple unadorned history of the Bible, one is apt to think that no special help would be needed to write such a narrative; but the simple in appearance is often the most difficult of performance; the perfection of art is the concealment of art; and when we examine more closely we find, in the sober simplicity and chaste dignity of the narrative, as contrasted with the grotesqueness of those other records, unmistakable marks of Divine Inspiration.

‘How idle is the assertion that not the historical, but only the moral and religious truths of the Bible are Inspired. How shall we make the separation? Do we not find that the spiritual truths are inextricably interwoven with the historical, and have in it their basis, their illustrative force, their objective application, while at the same time the history itself is in a large measure typical of spiritual and eternal truth? How can we get a correct idea of British Constitutional Law apart from a knowledge of Constitutional History? The great enactments of Magna Charta, the Petition of Right, and the Bill of Rights, can only be fully understood as they are studied in their historical settings. They are the product of the long struggle of the people under Plantagenets, Tudors, and Stuarts. So the law of Moses is to be studied in connection with the history of Israel, and much of the precious truth contained in the Old Testament is the fruit of the Divine forces operating in the nation’s history. The “foes of our faith” do not think lightly of the historical parts of the Bible. Ration-

alistic opposition has raged most fiercely against the Gospel history; and now the whole force of its attack is directed against the history of the Pentateuch, or, including the Book of Joshua, the *Hexateuch*, as the Critics are fond of calling it.

‘Admirers of the Wellhausen school sometimes tell us that the whole matter is a literary question, and does not affect faith and morals; but some, more candid, have confessed that it is far more than a question of literary criticism; it is a question involving spiritual and theological issues. Indeed, the Hexateuch is the basis upon which the remainder of the Old Testament rests, while the New in turn rests upon the Old. Discredit these books and you discredit the whole Revelation. Prove that they are forgeries, inventions, compilations, of a much later date than the time of Moses, and you not only rob them of their historical and truthful character, but you must also remove from the rest of the Book all allusions to the facts and promises, the laws and institutions of those discredited portions, and when you have done that, what have you left? No, we are not prepared to give up any part of the history; we feel that of the Book as a whole it is true—

“Pluck one thread and the web you mar,—  
Loose but one  
Of a thousand strings, and the paining jar  
Through all will run.”’

Thus we believe that the plain narratives of Genesis and other historical books, the sweet sonnets of Israel’s chief singers, the didactic wisdom of Solomon, the lofty flights of Isaiah, the pathetic elegies of Jeremiah, the weird visions of Ezekiel, the wondrous dreams of Daniel, the stirring

appeals of Joel, the fiery denunciations of Amos, the deep theology of Paul, the practical counsel of James, the earnest exhortations of Peter, the marvellous imagery of John, and the matchless biography of the Evangelists, are all to us the Word of our God. God can bring music out of any instrument, and He takes up a learned Moses, a poetical David, a courtly Isaiah, a plaintive Jeremiah, a rugged Amos, a bold Peter, a polished Paul, and, touching their hearts by the breath of His Spirit, they vibrate forth harmonious melody, the music of each instrument being according to its own nature. Thus the Bible becomes a universal Book; utterly unlike the Koran, with its stilted monotony, it appeals to men as men. The Vedas for the Hindus, the Zendavesta for the Parsees, the Koran for Mohammedans, but the Bible for mankind.

There may be things recorded which seem to us unimportant or unmeaning, but we must remember that the same Spirit which gave the Word is needed to explain it. If you think of the Bible as a Book *from God*, you may be surprised to find certain things in it; but if you think of it as a Book *from God to man* these things will be seen to be a necessary part of the whole. Some parts you may not regard as so intrinsically precious as others, but these serve as the setting of the priceless jewels, and enable us to appreciate their full beauty. The bark and leaves of the tree of Revelation are as necessary as the flowers and fruit. In the body of Scripture truth there are many parts, and each member has not the same office, but God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased Him, and hath tempered the body together, so that there is no schism in the body.

In further justification of the view that Inspiration pertains to the language of Scripture, we may say that it need be no surprise to find words treated as of such importance in the Bible, when we see that in every department of literature they are so much considered. Of course we know that there may be words without thoughts, or, at any rate, without thoughts of any value. 'Words, words, words,' unfortunately we have often to say when listening to some discourse. Again, some have the art of so using words as to justify the cynical statement that language was given to *conceal* thought; but, however that may be, words are necessary for the proper expression of thought, and any man who wishes to find acceptance with the people will, like the Preacher, seek out 'acceptable words.'

How important is the right use of words in legal documents, although lawyers have been known to pile up words without much meaning, in the days when the amount of their fee depended upon the length of the document. Take these two examples--Contracts and Wills. How essential in these cases is the wording employed! If a contract made by deed is in question, every phrase of that deed is scanned, every word is scrutinized, and the law will enforce it strictly according to the terms, the general rule being not to go behind the writing. So in regard to wills. It is the design of the law to give effect to the intention of the testator, but that intention is to be gathered from the words, and there are many technical words which, if used by an unskilful testator, may be taken to mean something very different from what he intended; and so it has happened that many a man's property has been disposed of in a manner entirely different from what he intended, simply because the right

words had not been employed. Our Bible is the great deed of Covenant whereby our God has made over to us all spiritual blessings: it is His Will wherein we find the disposition He has made, the legacies He has left us. Is it not, then, of supreme importance that His gracious intentions should be correctly expressed? and is it not likely that He would see that the right words were employed? Or take History; what is it that distinguishes such writers as Macaulay and Froude from those of the 'Dryasdust' school? Is it not largely—I do not say entirely, but largely—the way in which they express themselves? They may, in many cases, relate the same facts as others, but they invest the narrative with a grace, an elegance, a beauty, which marks them out as masters of the art. So, too, in Oratory, how much depends upon the phraseology employed! Old thoughts may be set forth in fresh words, adorned with new illustrations, and they will carry new force, and give the speaker the credit of originality of thought. How often, too, good thoughts will be a burden to hear, because expressed in poor language, while poor thought may, through the adornment of beautiful language, interest and please.

Take Literature generally; in judging any book, we always have regard to the language. What is it that men admire in Homer, in Virgil, in Plato? Is it simply the fine thought there found? is there not also a charm, a grace, a beauty about the words themselves? The appropriateness of the epithets, the skilful placing of the particles, the fine choice of synonyms and, indeed, the whole phraseology, win our admiration, and stamp the production as the work of a master mind.

There are many who tell us that Scripture is inspired in



the same way as Shakespeare, or Dante, or Goethe; but when, looking at any particular poem, they say 'that is inspired,' what do they mean? Do they only regard the thought as inspired? or do they not also consider the expression of the thought? and is it not chiefly the way in which the thoughts are expressed that marks them as something different from ordinary productions? And shall we expect less in connection with that Book which we believe to be inspired in a far higher sense? In it we have the most important history, the noblest oratory, the grandest philosophy, the finest poetry. In it we have the vastest, noblest, most sublime thoughts expressed in the most appropriate language. Yes, we do love Pure Thought; but it is when Queenly Thought robes herself in the well-fitting garment of beautiful language that we greatly desire her beauty.

Not less important is the right use of words in ordinary life. In business transactions, in social intercourse, in the varied kinds of communications which pass among men, there is constant liability to misunderstanding if the wrong words are employed. We are continually hearing public speakers complain of the injustice done them by reporters, who, not having given the exact words used, have failed rightly to represent the thought.

Be it remembered, too, that if the Lawyer, the Historian, the Orator, the Poet, and the Philosopher, need to be particular about words, the *Theologian* cannot afford to be indifferent to them. There is no doctrine of Scripture but what is built upon *words*. Where would be the doctrine of Believers' Baptism if the words descriptive of the ordinance are not inspired? What of Election, Atonement, or any

other doctrine? Could it be possible to sustain it without a discussion as to the meaning of particular words? and if these words do not partake of Inspiration, then vain is the attempt to construct any system of theology.

I might have noticed, also, that in view of what has been said about Revelation and Inspiration, so far from having the thought inspired, and the words not, you may have the very opposite phenomenon, the words inspired and the thought uninspired. Thus the thought conveyed by the serpent's words was certainly uninspired, but the words being given in the account by Inspiration are to that extent inspired as forming part of the Inspired record.

Brethren, let us cling to the Infallibility of the Scriptures, in spite of the taunts which are levelled at us by those who say that belief in an infallible book is only another form of the Romanist delusion of an infallible Pope, or infallible Church. What do they set up instead? Why, in many cases, the infallibility of their own consciousness, forsooth! They will take the parts of the Bible which 'find' them, and put aside the rest. Let us take what we find of the Bible, and take it as we find it, and we shall err on the safe side.

Some of the rejecters of the doctrine of Full Inspiration profess to believe in the Infallibility of Christ. We do not yield to them in that belief, but we hold that Christ is to be known through the Word. We believe the Word Infallible because Christ treated it as being so, and we see not how His Infallibility and Authority can be maintained apart from that Word. Without the objective Word as a guide, faith in Christ's Infallibility would resolve itself into a matter of individual consciousness. That Word, which in early days

withstood triumphantly all the assaults of Pagan philosophy, and has ever proved victorious in all subsequent conflicts with Infidelity and Rationalism in every form, is not about to succumb now to the Higher, or any other Criticism. The Divine life throbs in the Grand Old Book; hence its pristine vigour and imperial sway. We may modify and apply to it the words of that great Scottish author, who, in his dying hours, called the Bible the only Book worthy the name:

‘Ours is no sapling, chance-sown by the fountain,  
Blooming in summer, in winter to fade;  
When the whirlwind has stripped every leaf on the mountain,  
The more shall the Christian exult in its shade.  
Moored in the rifted rock, proof to the tempest shock,  
Firmer he roots him the ruder it blow;  
Angels and Christian men, echo its praise again,  
The Bible, the Bible, the Word of the Lord.’

---

‘THE SUM OF THY WORD IS TRUTH AND EVERY ONE OF  
THY RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENTS ENDURETH FOR EVER.’—Psalm  
cxix. 160.

PART II.  
*THE DOCTRINE DEFENDED.*

(OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.)

---

LECTURE X.

THE SUPPOSED IMPOSSIBILITY OF A BOOK REVELATION.—ALLEGED  
UNWORTHY AND CONTRADICTIONARY REPRESENTATIONS OF GOD.

HAVING to some extent discussed the Doctrine of Full Inspiration, although we have not by any means said all that might be said in its support, we come now to consider some of the objections that are brought against the doctrine, some of which are also advanced against every view of Inspiration. We shall deal with the latter first.

Little need be said of the *Alleged Impossibility of a Book Revelation*. This is a form of objection which was very prevalent a generation ago, but is not now very frequently heard, except from those who deny the credibility of any Revelation from God. The two ideas are practically one. If it is impossible for God to reveal Himself to man at all, then it is not possible that a Book Revelation could be given; but if God can in any way reveal Himself to His creatures, He can surely do so through the medium of a book written by someone whose heart He has touched.

Once believe in a Living God who cares for men, and a Revelation becomes not only possible, but very probable; and the Revelation in whatever manner given may surely be committed to writing, and transmitted to other generations.

God has revealed Himself in various ways. He has, by dream, by vision, by symbol, by actual displays of power and love, by direct utterance, communicated truth concerning Himself and men to human souls; and this communication, however made, might readily be communicated in turn by the recipients of it, either vocally or in writing. God has also revealed Himself in the history of His people, and it was surely no impossible thing for Him to prompt His servants to record that history which so wondrously reflects Himself. Especially is He revealed in the life of the Lord Jesus Christ; and it is not impossible, but very probable, that He should guide the Evangelists to portray that matchless life.

Once admit that God has thus revealed Himself, and we see the necessity for a Written Record of that Revelation, as without it the Revelation would only benefit those immediately receiving it; and it would be necessary constantly to repeat the Revelation if others were to share in the blessing. So that as a mere matter of Divine economy the Written Word becomes necessary.

It may be difficult to understand how the Infinite Spirit of God comes into contact with the finite spirit of man, and so influences it as to lead to the production of the Written Word; but mysterious as the process may be, it can certainly not be considered impossible by those who know from their own happy experience that the Great Spirit

does indeed influence theirs—‘that the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God.’ And as men in all other departments of thought have ever been greatly influenced by the writings of their fellows, it would be quite a likely thing for God to make use of such a method of reaching men’s hearts.

The fact, too, that in connection with most religious systems there have been ‘Sacred Books,’ is conclusive evidence that such a method of appealing to men is recognised as effective; while it also shows that so far from men deeming it an impossibility for God thus to communicate with them, they have ever been predisposed to expect it.

But even apart from any direct influence of the Spirit in the act of writing, the simple recording of the Revelation by those who received it would in itself constitute a Book Revelation, though we believe that the Spirit’s guidance in the writing is necessary for perfect accuracy. This being so, it is plain that to deny the possibility of a written Revelation is practically to deny that any revelation from the spiritual world could be given. It is to take the illogical position of the Deist, and believe that while there is a God, He can have no interest in man, or if He has, cannot break through the barrier erected by His own hands in order that He may speak with His creatures. It is to take the unreasonable position of the Agnostic, that if there is a God, we have no means of knowing of His existence, which amounts to saying that He has no means of making Himself known to us.

For a most interesting discussion on the whole question of a Book Revelation, I refer you to Henry Rogers’ brilliant



volume 'The Eclipse of Faith,' where it is handled in a way which ought to settle it for ever.

Before leaving this point, however, we may look at the kindred assumption—avowed in some quarters, latent in others—as to the incredibility of the supernatural.

It is well known that some of the leading Higher Critics on the Continent have distinctly disavowed belief in the supernatural, and in their treatment of the Sacred Record, it is a guiding principle to reject as legendary, mythical, fabulous, any portion that recognises this supernatural element. Indeed, it is not too much to say that such men as Wellhausen and Kuenen do not believe in the possibility of a Revelation, and the Hebrew Scriptures are to them on a level with other so-called Sacred books, with the mythologies of all other nations.

We do not for a moment say that the English representatives of the Critical School hold the same views on this point, but inasmuch as they so closely follow these Rationalistic leaders in their method of dealing with the Scriptures, the practical result is very much the same; the supernatural element, if not denied, is, to a large extent, ignored, or is minimized and explained away.

Thus the story of the Creation miracle is resolved into a couple of contradictory myths; the tragedy of the Fall, with the supernatural element involved, is nothing better. The miraculous Deluge is a mere tradition; the Theophanies of patriarchal times are but dreams of a golden age. The marvellous Revelation of Jehovah in Egypt, at the Red Sea, on the slopes of Sinai, at the banks of Jordan, are but late fictions dressed up in the garb of history to recommend a newly-organized priestly system, and invest with awful

dignity a priestly class. The stories of the wonders wrought through such prophets of God as Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, are but fabulous legends—‘the wild growths of popular tradition.’ And yet we are asked to believe that the Criticism which yields such results ‘does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament—it *pre-supposes* it; and it thus helps us to frame truer conceptions of the methods which it has pleased God to employ in revealing Himself to His ancient people of Israel.’

We fail to see how such stories of what never happened could well be the vehicles of Divine Revelation, and we find it very difficult indeed to understand how Divine Inspiration could attach to productions which came into existence through such questionable methods as their writers are represented as using. All the difficulties pertaining to the old doctrine of Inspiration are as nothing compared to this.

We do believe that God could and did reveal Himself in the ordinary history of His people, but we see not how that could be of any service to us, unless we have a correct record of it; and if the true story of His dealings with them has been hitherto unknown, and is only now being disentangled for us by the Higher Critics from a mass of false and misleading tales, myths, legends, fables, we certainly cannot think that the Inspiration has been a very prominent factor.

We prefer to take the history as it has been given, and, while seeing God in the ordinary affairs of His nation, see Him still more manifestly in the ever-recurring displays of His supernatural power, His infinite love.

To the mind of a Higher Critic, who also claims to be

most Evangelical, there may be 'something which might almost raise a smile in the sight of earnest religious men seeking to vindicate the inerrant accuracy of contradictory statements, and the infallible certainty of events which, *if not impossible, are certainly in a high degree improbable*'; but we shall nevertheless continue to believe in the occurrence of these events, and *vindicate* their infallible certainty as part of the Divine and unerring Record.

We cannot understand why Christian men should shy at the supernatural factor, and especially why Christian ministers should seek to tone down the supernatural element in the Word of God. To us the Old Testament Revelation would be shorn of its chief glory if the supernatural element were eliminated. It seems absolutely necessary to any real assuming of the nation of Israel into covenant relationship with Jehovah that some supernatural Revelation of Himself should have been given. If Abraham was to be guided by anything else than his own fancies, if he was to arrive at the knowledge of spiritual religion amid a nation of idolaters, then in some way the 'God of Glory' must have appeared to him, and the manifestation must, in its essence, have been supernatural. If the nation was to be delivered from Egyptian bondage by a God-sent leader, then it was necessary that that leader should show his credentials in the miracles which God wrought through him. And so all through, the fact of God's presence with His people made the manifestation of the supernatural always possible. Apart from the supernatural element, we repeat, the Jewish religion would be but one of many self-developed religions, a merely human growth.

As Christians, we are familiar with the supernatural.

Christianity in resting, as it does, upon the Revelation of the Old Testament, partakes of the supernatural. Christianity is nothing—it is a fraud—if it be not a Supernatural Revelation. The great miracles of the Incarnation and Resurrection, with which Christianity is bound up, dwarf all other miracles. The miracles wrought by Christ when on earth were but the natural outcome of the Incarnation, and these physical miracles have been, since the crowning miracle of the Resurrection, eclipsed by the ‘greater works’ which through His followers, by the energy of the Holy Ghost, and the power of the Gospel, the Ascended Christ has through the centuries been performing since He went to His Father.

It is, perhaps, not to be wondered at, in view of the treatment accorded to these venerable Writings, that Canon Driver should consider that the ‘common use of the expression “Word of God,” as a term descriptive of the entire Bible, may sometimes give rise to misunderstanding,’ and that he should advise accompanying it, if used at all, with some qualifying expression, as ‘The Word of God *mediated by a human agency*’!

Dr. Horton, following Dr. Driver, as he generally does, says it is ‘by a careless inexactness of speech’ that ‘the whole Book or Bible’ has been called the ‘Word of God’; the practice has often ‘given rise to serious misconceptions’; ‘the loose and careless habit of describing the Bible as the Word of God is more than any other single cause responsible for the infidel literature which has flooded the Protestant world.’ He further declares that when questioned as to their authority for such usage, ‘good people’ have only one of two answers to give; ‘if they are *honest*, they are bound

to admit that the usage is without Scriptural authority; if they are *dishonest*, they *angrily* turn upon those who put the question, and denounce them as infidels.'

By the way, we may note that it is characteristic of this writer to be constantly attributing blind credulity and bad temper to the orthodox party. Thus in one of his books, speaking of believers in full Inspiration, he says that they 'are rendered violent and denunciatory by the slightest question of their position, because they have a suspicion that they have no proof to offer, except their own assertion; and they think that their assertion is made stronger by the use of anathemas and horrified expressions of pious reprobation.' Again, 'such men require us all to admit their dogma before they will argue with us.' When asked for proof of their belief 'that the Scriptures are God's Word, infallible, authentic, complete,' 'No is the answer, we will not; you shall accept it as the first condition of the argument.' Yet again, 'What proof have you of this infallible Inspiration? . . . And at last the poor and insufficient answer is forced to come out, We have no reason to give, except the arbitrary dogma of the Church.' Now, the man who can write thus about his brethren has surely not taken the pains to understand their position. We know not where such unreasoning, sharp-tempered, ill-instructed 'good' people are to be found. In any case, they can certainly not be taken as fair representatives of the believers in the 'Infallible Inspiration of the Evangelists.'

Now, as to the title 'Word of God,' we shall not turn agrily upon anyone, but we do not 'admit that the usage is without Scriptural authority.' We have already shown that we do not consider every part of the Bible to be a

Revelation in the sense of being a direct communication from God of truth before unknown; but inasmuch as the whole is given by Inspiration of God, the common use of the expression Word of God is well warranted. In many of the passages of the Old Testament which have come before us we saw that what the people then had of the Scriptures was called the Word of God. Christ Himself, in the tenth of John, takes 'Scripture' and 'Word of God' as synonymous terms. When rebuking the Pharisees for making the 'Word of God' of none effect by their traditions, he manifestly means the whole Old Testament Canon, and we have also seen how He speaks of such an historical statement as Gen. ii. 24 as what '*God* said.' 'Holy Scriptures,' as used by the Apostles, must surely be equal to the 'Word of God,' since they were 'holy,' because from Him. Paul calls the whole Old Testament 'the *Oracles* of God,' and certainly the 'Word of God' is no stronger term. Since all these passages warrant the description of the Old Testament Scriptures as the Word of God, and as we have seen the New is in the same way Inspired, we can legitimately apply the title to the whole.

Some are very much afraid of the Word of God getting too exalted a place, but the Christian consciousness has been rightly guided hitherto, and is not now likely to cease calling the Sacred Book by the time-honoured name, 'Word of God.'

The use of the very word 'Scripture' is significant. Why keep that word for one set of Scriptures? Any writing is a Scripture, but it is seldom that we use the word of any but the 'Sacred Scriptures'; we freely use other derivatives of the root-word, and speak of inscription,



description, rescript, etc., but by tacit agreement 'Scripture' has its own special use.

So with the word Bible. All know that *Biblos* (βιβλος) is simply a book; then why not call any other book a Bible? Just because men have always felt the superiority of that one Book. It is the Book of God, and so, worthy of being signalized among all other books as the Bible, the Book as it is often called, the Grand Old Book.

Dr. Horton, we fancy, in spite of himself, will continue to speak of the Bible as the Word of God. Indeed, in the very book where he condemns most strongly the expression, and that for two reasons, because there is much in the Bible that is not the Word of God, and because there is much elsewhere that is the Word of God, he, nevertheless, speaks of 'the Bible' as 'the Word of God *par excellence*,' as in a 'unique and peculiar sense the Word of God.' Exactly so; and being thus uniquely the WORD OF GOD, we shall not hesitate so to designate

'This Book—this holy Book, on every line  
Marked with the seal of high Divinity,  
On every leaf bedewed with drops of love  
Divine; and with the eternal heraldry  
And signature of God Almighty stamped  
From first to last.'

2. *Unworthy and Contradictory Representations of God.*  
It is alleged that the anthropomorphic representations of God are degrading, and that especially as compared with the New Testament, the Old Testament revelations of His character are fragmentary and contradictory. This objection rests upon a very superficial acquaintance with the Word of God. That frequent anthropomorphisms, that is, conceptions of God clothed in language drawn from the

character and conduct of men, are found in the Bible is fully admitted; but we see not how any objection to the reality and reasonableness of the Revelation can thereupon be founded. In all the writings of the ancients where the nature of God is discussed, similar anthropomorphisms occur; and, indeed, it is impossible for anyone even now to speak or write intelligently about the Divine Being without using such expressions.

But if the Bible speaks of God in the language of men as hating, grieving, repenting, rejoicing; as walking, resting, rising, sitting; if it speaks of His arm being made bare, His right hand being exalted, His face being turned away; if it speaks of the glance of His eyes, the breath of His nostrils, the word of His mouth; it at the same time so represents Him as to make it impossible for a thoughtful reader to take such expressions literally, and believe that God is altogether such an one as ourselves. It is clearly intimated that God is without body, parts or passions, that He is absolutely and essentially spirit, that He is the Infinite One whose nature transcends all forms of human speech.

It is the Bible alone which gives this lofty and sublime representation of Deity. In the Bible the anthropomorphic is clearly shown to be figurative. In other ancient systems, the anthropomorphic became the real, and the gods were actually held to be in the likeness of men. The gods of Greece and Rome are simply gigantic men, with all men's lusts and passions magnified.

But while it is very possible for this anthropomorphism to be abused, it remains true that we, as at present constituted, cannot intelligently express our conceptions of

God without using it. And even those who decry the Bible phraseology are obliged to resort to similar language when they speak of the Divine Being's relations with man. Apart from such language, at best the idea of God must be very vague and indistinct. Talk of the Infinite All, the Incomprehensible Someone, or Somewhat, the Power not ourselves which makes for righteousness, and you may as well erect your altar and carve the inscription to the 'Unknown God.' To all such worshippers, the Bible comes saying, with the Apostle, 'Whom, therefore, ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you.'

It is worthy of consideration, too, though we may not now dwell upon it, that this necessity of our nature for a conception of God expressed in the terms of humanity has been fully met by the Incarnation. In the New Testament the revelation of God in Christ Jesus amplifies and fulfils all the hints and preludings of the Old; and while we are still solemnized by the awful declaration, 'No man hath seen God at any time,' we can, and forever will, rejoice in the assurance that 'the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.'

As to the other part of this objection, that the Old Testament revelation is fragmentary and contradictory, we admit that in a sense it is fragmentary, but we emphatically deny its contradictoriness.

If by fragmentary you mean imperfect glimpses of His character, which leave men in darkness as to His relation to them, and their duty to Him, we demur to the statement; but if you mean that God is not fully revealed in all the absolute and infinite perfection of His Being, then we say that neither in the Old nor in the New Testament is such

a revelation possible; but that is an objection, not against the Bible, but against the finite nature of man; and until the finite can comprehend the Infinite, such a Revelation cannot be given.

It is true that in some respects the Old Testament revelation of God is less full and clear than the New; but in the Old, as in the New, the Revelation is sufficient for all practical purposes, and if throughout the Bible we find that the manifestation of God has been adapted to the needs of His people, and that fuller statements of truth have been deferred because they could not bear them all at once, that is no charge against the Bible, but a proof of its wisdom and Divinity, and a confirmation of its own assertion that God spake 'at sundry times, and in divers manners.'

We maintain, however, that there is nothing contradictory in the revelation of God which the Bible in any of its parts presents. It is customary for objectors to say that the God of the Old Testament is unlike the God of the New; that in the Old He is a stern and wrathful Deity, but in the New a God of Infinite love and compassion, in whose gracious character wrath has no place. In the Old we see merely the national God of the narrow-minded Jews; in the New the God of humanity at large—the Universal Father. There is hardly enough truth in the statement to sweeten it, while error lurks in every part of it. It is true that the Old Testament reveals the inflexible Justice, the deserved wrath of God; but it is also true that it reveals Him as a God of love. The very core of the Mosaic Revelation is found in that marvellous proclamation of the Divine Name, 'The Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, long suffering,

and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin.' There is nothing in the New Testament to surpass that. It is equalled by such passages as, 'God so loved the world,' 'Herein is love'; but no one can feel that there is any conflict between these declarations—the later but emphasize the earlier. Indeed, the fact of God's love could not in *words* be more fully declared; the Revelation of the Son of God set forth that love more wondrously and convincingly by *deeds*; but the love is the same glorious reality.

Nor is the great passage I have quoted an isolated assertion in the Old Testament. The music that so grandly reverberated along the slopes of Sinai echoes and re-echoes throughout the whole Old Testament. You hear it in the historical books; it is the dominant note in the Psalms; it throbs through all the prophets. Quotations might be multiplied in proof, but surely he reads the Old Testament through strange spectacles who does not see a God of Love.

On the other hand, it is, of course, as much a mistake to imagine that the New Testament knows only of the Love of God, and has no revelation of Justice and Wrath. The Gospel reveals the righteousness of God as clearly as the Law. It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, 'because therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith. For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.' That sounds pretty much like an Old Testament sentiment, does it not? If in the Old we read that 'God will by no means clear the guilty,' that 'He is

angry with the wicked every day'; that He is 'a great God and terrible': we also read in the New that 'the wrath of God abideth on' the unbeliever; that the sinner is 'treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath'; that there will be 'indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil'; that 'It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,' 'for our God is a consuming fire.' It is the veriest ignorance of the contents of the Revelation that asserts any contradiction here.

As to the other part of the objection, while admitting that God appears in the Old Testament in a special relation to His people Israel, we utterly deny that He is set forth as the God of the Jews alone. Abraham knows Him as 'the Judge of all the earth'; and as the 'Lord of the whole earth' He is frequently represented in the Psalms. 'All people that on earth do dwell' are called upon to worship Him. And throughout the whole of the prophetic books there are intimations to be found of God's interest in other nations beside the Jews. An attentive reader of the history of the Divine dealings with the Jews will see that God's choice of them, and His special care over them, prepared the way for blessing to the world at large. All His dealing with them was leading up to the fulfilment of the promise made to their father Abraham, 'In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.' Many indications were given of God's grace to others, as in the witness-bearing of Daniel at Babylon, and especially in that great object-lesson, the repentance and salvation of Nineveh.

True, many of the Jews, especially in later times, perverted the truth and fancied that God had no care for any



but themselves; but from their own Scriptures, as well as from the Gospel Revelation, Paul could declare that 'God was not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles'; and there is not a single passage of the Old Testament, when rightly interpreted, that can be considered in conflict with that statement.

Then, again, while the New Testament more clearly shows the grace of God to the world at large, there is assuredly no ground for the assertion that it reveals Him as the Universal Father. This dogma, the outcome of weak sentimentalism and weaker exegesis, lies at the basis of all the modern systems of false theology; but it is not found in the Word of God. Such a doctrine would be utterly inconsistent with the idea of Atonement, would render unnecessary the doctrine of Regeneration, would overthrow the doctrine of Election, and blot out the doctrine of Future Punishment, and it is no surprise to find that those who seriously believe in the Universal Fatherhood speedily relinquish all these other doctrines.

I only note, but cannot dwell at length upon, the fact that in this matter, as in others, the Higher Criticism is found joining hands with Infidelity; for one of its main contentions is that the conceptions of God which the Elohist writer, P, entertains are very different from those of the Jehovistic writer, J. P's conception is strictly *monotheistic*; J's not *rigidly* so. P has a lofty idea of the *power* and benevolence of God; that power can by a *word* cause 'creation to spring into existence.' J represents creation as the work of a supernatural being, 'but *hardly* as the work of an *infinite* being.' By P 'true piety is conceived as a walking with God,' a phrase which in J would

be meaningless, who allows everybody to 'walk and talk with God.' P's 'representation of God is lofty, dignified, and in striking contrast with that of J.'

These are examples enough of the ideas entertained concerning the earlier portions of the Old Testament, unless we add the further consideration that, according to J, sacrifice was approved of from the beginning, whereas, according to P, it was first instituted and recognised after the Exodus. I shall not attempt to refute this view, which surely cannot consistently be maintained in connection with any doctrine of real Inspiration.

That the different titles of God suggest different *aspects* of His character we are glad to believe; that *Elohim* suggests specially the ideas of power and majesty, and *Jehovah* covenant relationship, faithfulness, grace, has long been the belief of Evangelical students of the Word, but that any *contradictory* representation is suggested by these titles is abhorrent to any right idea of Divine Revelation, and is entirely disproved by a careful examination of the usages of the two words. 'The LORD' (*Jehovah*) 'our God' (*Elohim*) 'is one Lord.'

No, the Word of God is consistent with itself: it is one God that is revealed in the Old Testament, and the God of the Old is also the God of the New Testament, and so we find Christ constantly speaking to the Jews of God as the One who was revealed to them in their own Scriptures, and His Apostles ever asserted that it was the 'God of their fathers who raised up His Son Jesus.'

## LECTURE XI.

### ALLEGED IMMORALITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

INFIDELS have always been loud in their outcry against what they have considered as violations of morality sanctioned in the Old Testament, generally ignoring the fact that it is from the Bible that they have gained the lofty ideas of morality by which they seek to judge and condemn some portions of it. The sad thing nowadays is that infidels are out-distanced by professed teachers of the Word of God in asserting the immoral character of much of the Old Testament. The so-called moral difficulties are of three kinds: 1. Those which consist of *actions which seem at variance with the moral law, but are commanded by God, or recorded with Divine approval*. Such, for instance, as the supplanting of Esau by Jacob, the killing of Sisera by Jael, the extermination of the Canaanites, the slaughter of the enemies of the Jews in the days of Esther.

In regard to the first instance, it is neither commanded nor commended; we need carefully to distinguish between what is recorded as a fact simply, and what is mentioned with approval. There is no hint whatever that God approved of the conduct of Jacob and Rebekah. It is true that Jacob was Divinely chosen in preference to Esau, and that the blessing was given in connection with the deceitful

act, but no approval of the sin is thereby implied. God had purposed that the blessing should be given to Jacob, but it was a morally wrong thing for Jacob to deceive his father with the intent of obtaining the blessing, and the exile of the deceiver was a punishment for his sin—a punishment that pressed not only upon him, but upon his fond but foolish mother, who never again saw her darling son.

The case of Jael and Sisera is somewhat different. There the act of Jael is celebrated in the song of the inspired prophetess. We cannot but feel that the deception practised by Jael to get Sisera into her power was wrong in itself, and the whole affair seems a breach of the most sacred rites of Oriental hospitality. But it is just possible, as some have said, that when first she invited him in and treated him kindly, she did not think of taking his life, and that only after he fell asleep did she conceive the thought of killing him as the enemy of God's Israel. In any case, the vengeance that fell upon Sisera was just to him, who had done such cruel wrong to the people of God, and it was fitting that the outrager of women should fall by the hand of a woman. Still, we are not concerned to justify the conduct of Jael in every particular; she is called 'blessed among women,' and her action in slaying him is approved, but as to the morality of that action it forms part of the larger question of the extermination of the Canaanites.

It is asked, Was not the command to destroy the Canaanites in itself immoral? Was it consistent with the character of God, who had said, 'Thou shalt not kill'? So far as the Israelites were concerned, was it not murder and robbery? We might answer that the command of God

must be right, and must legalize any act commanded. But we see sufficient reason for the command to deprive it of any arbitrary or unjust character. These nations had sinned so grievously against God that it was in accordance with Divine justice that they should be punished with utter destruction. Evidently they had reached such a pitch of wickedness that they were irreclaimable, and justice could no longer spare them. Long before, God, in foretelling to Abraham the sojourn of his seed in the land of Egypt, gave as a reason for the long delay in bringing them into Canaan, that the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full; but when their iniquity was full, and the hour set in His purpose had arrived, the judgment fell upon them.

The only difficulty is in the nature of their punishment, but that is a matter to be referred to the sovereign wisdom of God. He might have swept them away as He did the Antediluvians, or the inhabitants of the cities of the plain, and He would have dealt justly; instead of that He chooses to employ His people to execute His purposes of judgment, and in doing so He acts no less justly. By an angel He slew the firstborn of Egypt, and the host of Sennacherib, and one feels in regard to these events that they were direct and terrible, but just judgments of God; the destruction of the Canaanites by the hand of men may not be so direct, but is it any the less a *just* judgment of God? Then there is the consideration that in the interests of morality itself their overthrow seemed necessary. One reason given for their destruction was lest they should teach the Israelites to do after their abominations and worship their gods, and so sin against the Lord—not an imaginary danger, as the sequel proved.

Now we have to remember that it was only through the chosen people that the truth of God could be conserved and the true religion maintained, and to do that it was necessary that they should be a separate people. Had they mingled with these other nations, they would soon have been swallowed up in the flood of iniquity. Even those who cry out most loudly against the extermination as opposed to the principles of morality, would to-day approve of similar conduct in similar circumstances. Suppose that in the midst of our land there was a district or county inhabited by people like these Canaanites; conceive them living in all manner of open profligacy, setting at defiance all the laws of God and man, worshipping false gods with cruel and sensual rites, and by their debasing example contaminating and corrupting all that came in contact with them. Would any wise legislature allow such a state of things to continue? Would it not seek to root out such a colony, supposing all means of reformation failed? Would it not be in the interest of morality itself that such a community should be suppressed? Would not the very conduct depicted, combined with the requirements of true morality, constitute a Divine command to take vengeance upon them? There is certainly, when we consider the Israelites as God's instruments, carrying out His purpose of vengeance, nothing more immoral in the destruction of the Canaanites than in the sentence passed by a judge upon a criminal, and its execution by the officers of the law.

It may be said, 'Admitting that the Canaanites deserved to be destroyed on account of their great wickedness, and that the Israelites may be considered as instruments of the Divine vengeance, why was it that they were sent against



them rather than against other nations who might be considered equally wicked?' It is sufficient to say that God as a sovereign saw fit to inflict the judgment upon the Canaanites then, and if His mercy spared others, that cannot be made a cause of complaint. But there is a consideration which may make it seem highly reasonable that the Israelites should be sent against these particular nations. God, whose prerogative it is, according even to New Testament teaching, to appoint for all nations 'the bounds of their habitation,' had centuries before given Palestine to Abraham and his seed. They had really taken possession of a large part of it, and by the laws of nations acquired a prescriptive right to it. Though, in the providence of God, led down to Egypt, they did not relinquish their claim to the land of promise, as the burial of the patriarch Jacob and the assurance of Joseph showed. It would seem that after the descent into Egypt, the Canaanites, who had before obtained a footing in Palestine, but seem to have been few and to have occupied but a small part of it, increased greatly and spread all over the land, and thus really held the territory given by promise to Abraham, and taken possession of by him under the distinct guidance of God; so that even according to the principles of international law the Israelites might well claim the land of their fathers, and dispossess the intruders. That, at least, is a point that has been ably argued by some eminent writers, and may well be considered in connection with this discussion. In any case, it remains as the declaration of Revelation that 'When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the children of men, He set the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the children of Israel.'

Let the weighty words of the great Butler be also borne in mind, that 'Men have no right to either life or property, but what arises solely from the grant of God; when this grant is revoked, they cease to have any right at all in either; and when this revocation is made known, as surely it is possible it may be, it must cease to be unjust to deprive them of either.'

Thus considered, the charge of immorality or injustice can no more be brought against the Divine procedure in the overthrow of these nations, than a similar charge could be brought against the providential government of God when multitudes are destroyed by such natural phenomena as earthquakes and pestilence.

There is another question connected with this, viz., 'So far as the Israelites were concerned, was not their employment in such a work as the conquest of Canaan immoral, and fitted to make them cruel and wicked? We answer, Its effect was the reverse. They had to perform a work from which their feelings revolted, and from which the dictates of their religion led them to shrink. The work was abnormal: it was God's strange work, though God's command was all the more imperative, and none the less just and beneficent in its tendency. As Butler says, "Though a course of external action which, without command, would be immoral, might make an immoral habit, yet a few detached commands have no such tendency." And with all their faults, no people of antiquity whose records have come down to us were less stained with cruelty than the Israelites. The work, while they were engaged in it, had rather a salutary tendency than otherwise. It must have brought strongly before them the terrible demerit of

crimes such as those of the Canaanites,' and must have given them more exalted notions of the holiness and justice of God.

We may add there are many things connected with war, such as lying and deception, which, though wrong in themselves, are not more so than war in itself considered; and when the war is commanded as being in the circumstances a necessity, it may be that the other matters are also involved, and so, many actions that are recorded in connection with the conquest and subsequent struggles may be explained; but the great fact to be kept in view is that the extermination of these idolaters was in accordance with the just command of God, and was the due punishment of their sin, though inflicted by human instruments, although many of the individual actions of these ministers of judgment may be open to condemnation, and are not spoken of in the Word itself with approval.

As to the case of the slaughter of the Amalekites by the Jews in the time of Esther, which is so repulsive to Dr. Horton and Dr. Clifford, not only do these principles apply, inasmuch as the Divine decree had ages before gone forth that the remembrance of Amalek should be blotted out from under heaven, and it was only through the partial disobedience of the Israelites that they had been spared; but the Jews acted in strict self-defence; for, according to the unaltered decree of the king, the Amalekites could and would have slain them; but in executing the more recent decree, the Jews forestalled their ancient enemies, averted their vengeance, and fulfilled the long-neglected word of God.

2. It is objected that *the morality of the Old Testament is*

*of a very low order, and is utterly opposed to the morality of the New.* Now, in some respects, we admit that the morality of the New is of a higher and more spiritual kind than that of the Old. In the infancy of the Jewish race, God might well allow certain practices, which in maturity are to be condemned and repudiated. The Revelation of the New Testament immeasurably transcends that of the Old—not, however, so much by way of contrast as by way of development and amplification; the religion therein made known is intensely spiritual and grandly universal, and the morality involved in it must, therefore, be of the most lofty spiritual character. This arises, however, not so much from any change in the external form of morality, as from the fact that the life of Jesus Christ supplies a new and perfect embodiment and example of morality, that His death furnishes a new motive-power for holy living, and that by His Spirit His people are incorporated into a spiritual fellowship as distinct from the national association of the ancient Israel.

Making full allowance, then, for the real superiority of the New Testament, and admitting that in certain things there seems to have been an accommodation of moral principle to the condition of the people, we still hold that the standard of morality was the law of the ten commandments; and there is no loftier demand in the New Testament. Christ in effect republished the Decalogue with more impressive sanctions than Sinai furnished, and the grand requirement in which that law finds its sum and essence, ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might; and thy neighbour as thyself,’ is still the standard of the Christian life.

From the declarations of the Sermon on the Mount it has been somewhat hastily inferred that Christ places His teaching in contrast with that of Moses, and practically abrogates much of the old law. His own explicit statement in that same sermon ought to have checked the hasty inference, 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.'

We must bear this in mind in examining the statements which follow: He contrasts the righteousness which is required of His disciples with that which prevailed among the Pharisees; and He goes on to show that the obedience, which His followers render, must be of a more spiritual kind than that which satisfied the Pharisees. He draws the contrast not so much between His own teaching and that of the Mosaic law, as between His teaching and that perverted interpretation of the law which the Pharisees adopted.

The much-disputed formula, 'Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time,' seems to refer to the traditions of the elders. The Rev. Ver. has adopted the other rendering, 'It was said to them of old time'; and while, of course, that is a fair grammatical rendering, yet the context seems to bear out the old version, which is supported by many of the most eminent expositors.

The question is simply whether the dative *τοῖς ἀρχαίοις*, after the passive verb *ἐρρεθή*, is to be taken purely with a dative force 'reception,' or with an ablative force as equivalent to *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων*. Either meaning is equally

permissible grammatically, and even those who maintain the meaning 'to the ancients,' admit that the dative is used with this very verb with an ablative force. 'By the ancients,' then it was said, 'Thou shalt not kill,' and 'Whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment.' Moses, indeed, gave this command; but Christ does not set Himself in opposition to Moses, rather does He enjoin obedience to the precepts of the Scribes, when sitting in Moses' seat, when truly expounding the law. But these teachers had so expounded the command as if it only applied to the external *act of murder*; so Christ shows the full and true spiritual meaning of it, '*But I say* unto you, that everyone that is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment.' Again, 'Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery.' These Rabbis interpreted this also as applying simply to the outward act, '*But I say* unto you,' says Christ, 'that adultery pertains even to the lustful thought.' Again, 'Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.' Here the spirit of the traditional interpretation very plainly appears; not only was the precept confined to the love of *friends*, but the unwarrantable addition was made to the law, 'Hate thine enemy.' But '*I say* unto you, Love your enemies.' That the interpretation of these teachers was unwarrantable, and that Christ could not be opposing the teaching of the Old Testament, may be seen from a careful examination of the Old Testament itself, the inspired interpretation therein given of the law. It would be easy to quote from the Pentateuch, from the Psalms, and the Prophets, passages which set forth the more spiritual aspect of the law's requirements; but I



simply refer you to that specifically ethical treatise—the Book of Proverbs. There you have a specimen of the moral teaching into which the law blossomed, and in that book you will find passages parallel in thought, and almost in expression, to these three injunctions of Christ's. You have denunciations against anger in such words as, 'Wrath is cruel, and anger is outrageous, but who is able to stand against envy?' Adultery is shown to begin with the thought, and the charge is given, 'Let thine eyes look straight before thee,' and, 'Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life.' What more spiritual admonition than that could be given? As to the love of enemies, where shall we find a finer sentiment than that of the twenty-fifth of Proverbs? than which, even the inspired Apostle, in inculcating the Christian duty of kindness to enemies, can find nothing better to say, and, therefore, quotes it, 'If thine enemy hunger, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink, for thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward thee.' I feel sure that a closer examination of the teaching of the Old Testament, as a whole, would rescue it from the charge of inculcating, or approving, a low form of morality. As a revelation from God, we believe that it was *perfect* in kind, although it was not *complete*. With the New Testament crowning the Old, we have God's revelation not only perfect, but '*perfect and entire, lacking in nothing.*'

But now we pass to another phase of the Old Testament morality, an imperfect view of which has perhaps done most to encourage the objection with which we are dealing. Not only was the moral law given as a revelation of God's will and the standard of man's duty, but the people of Israel,

being God's nation, had civil laws given for their social guidance; and, being a typical people, ceremonial laws were promulgated which were designed to educate them and prepare them for the reception of Him to Whom all the types pointed.

Now, to them as a nation under the government of God, a theocracy, the civil enactments in some instances seem to have been somewhat of a relaxation of the moral law. To this Christ refers when He speaks of the law of divorce. This the Rabbis had also sadly abused; they allowed men to divorce their wives on the most trivial pretexts—such, for instance, as poor cooking; and in the Sermon on the Mount it is specially in opposition to their laxity that He asserts the true principle. But on another occasion they justify their procedure by referring to the law of Moses, which allowed a man to give his wife a bill of divorcement, and put her away; and then Christ says, 'Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so.' Thus He plainly intimates that that particular law was an accommodation to the low condition of the people; but in the same breath He asserts that the sanctity of the marriage tie was part of the Old Testament Revelation.

This law, then, was a civil law to meet the peculiar circumstances of the people. Moses permitted divorce to prevent greater evils; but even then the bill of divorcement in all likelihood would require some official sanction, and so partake of a legal character, whereas under the teaching of the Rabbis it was left to individual caprice. It must, however, be remembered that Christ expressly permits divorce still on the one ground of conjugal infidelity.

Other enactments, such as those that regulate slavery, are to be placed in the same category as having to do with the national and civic life of the people. Then there is specially mentioned by Christ the 'law of retaliation,' which is generally spoken of as so much at variance with the Gospel: 'Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, Resist not evil.'

Now, consistently with our interpretation of the other sayings, we think that Christ is here dealing with the traditional interpretation which admitted of *personal* retaliation, of men taking the law into their own hand and revenging themselves. Such a practice Christ utterly opposes, and inculcates instead gentleness and forbearance, the outcome of love even towards enemies.

But this law of retaliation was, no doubt, given by Moses, not, however, with the idea of allowing personal spite to gratify itself in its own way, but as a *legislative enactment* to be carried out by the magistrates, and so to discountenance private revenge. Even so, how are we to judge of this law in the light of the Gospel, and how estimate the whole spirit of that economy as exhibited in the punishments enjoined? It has recently been said, even by an advocate of the orthodox view, that Christ did set aside the old law, and that under the Mosaic dispensation God was dealing in justice, but under the Gospel in grace. That is partly true, but I should not care to state the case so baldly.

In the light of some of the passages I have noticed, I hesitate to speak of Christ setting aside the old law if you mean the system in its entirety, and that seemed to be the force of the remark to which I allude. In a modified sense, I accept it as applying to these civil and ceremonial laws

which were more or less of a temporary character fitted to the condition of the people then.

But in reality Christ did not set even these aside, for He did not assume the *rôle* of a temporal legislator; indeed, on more than one occasion He distinctly refused it. He only showed how the spirit of the Gospel received by His people would supersede the necessity for these requirements as applied to *them*.

Then as to the dealings of God in justice and in grace, we must beware of extreme statements. The Old Testament dispensation was certainly a dispensation of law, and justice was a prominent characteristic of the governmental display of His character which God gave, but grace was by no means lacking.

It was to a redeemed people—redeemed by grace—that the law was given; and the whole typical economy, with its sacrifices and priesthood, told of grace.

On the other hand, while under the present dispensation grace is the predominant feature, there are not lacking displays of justice; and in regard to God's government of men, while the great judgment is in the future, judgments do undoubtedly now fall upon men, both outside and inside the Church of Christ; witness the case of Herod Agrippa, of Elymas the sorcerer, of Ananias and Sapphira.

The true key, I think, is found in the fact that the Israelites were under the immediate government of God. He was their King, their Lawgiver, their Judge. Blessing followed upon obedience; but breaches of the laws, laid down for their guidance as His nation, had to be severely punished. Many of the punishments were more severe than the New Testament allows; but they were necessary

for the maintenance of good government. Strict dealing was needful in view of the surrounding evil. Disobedience to the laws of the theocracy was treason, idolatry was rebellion, and death or being cut off from the congregation was in many cases the only adequate punishment; and, considering the typical character of the nation, such punishment became also a type of exclusion from the kingdom of Christ. It shadowed forth the more terrible doom of 'destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power': 'For if the word spoken through angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?'

Under that dispensation, then, these laws and their penalties represented simply a different method of the Divine procedure. The difference was legislative and executive; but there is no essential difference as to the principles of morality. Be it remembered, too, that the Gospel does not abolish legislative rule and punishment among men. Much of what Christ says can only apply to His disciples. The high spiritual morality which He enjoins is only for spiritual men. Outside the Church of Christ, can men find any better model of government in the spirit of it than the Mosaic code of legislation? Indeed, all that is best in the laws of this and other civilized countries is based upon it. And Christ distinctly recognised the right of civil rulers to enforce the laws of the state; while Peter and Paul inculcate obedience to the 'powers that be' as being ordained of God.

According to the interpretations which some give of the requirements of the Gospel, all punishments would have to

be abolished. It is argued that the punishment of death especially, as being a part of the Mosaic system, and opposed to the Gospel injunction to love our enemies, ought to be discarded. I must not enter into a discussion of this point now, else I might show that the favourite passage, upon which the argument for the abolition of capital punishment is founded, 'Vengeance is Mine, saith the Lord, I will repay,' is a quotation from the song of Moses; and while true then, was not inconsistent with the punishment of death; while the spirit of love enforced in the quotation, which Paul next gives, found its expression in the same words in the olden times, the words we have already noticed as given in Proverbs, 'If thine enemy hunger, feed him,' etc. But if such arguments were to have any force, as applied to the region of civil and criminal law, we should have not only to pardon the murderers, but open all our prison-doors, disband our police, pension our judges, place our homes at the disposal of burglars, give our purses to thieves, and proclaim a universal jubilee to all evil-doers. It comes to this, that the Old Testament morality is still lofty enough, even for the present enlightened day, and the full development of its spirit, as exemplified in the Gospel, can only be appreciated by those who are under the influence of the Gospel.

I ought to add a word as to the comparison, to the disadvantage of the Old Testament, between the law in its range and outlook bounded by the conduct, and the Gospel in its far-reaching spirit. It is true that the law mainly regards actions, but this does not prove a low state of morality in the old dispensation; it is the characteristic of all law as administered by men. Law can only take account of overt



acts and words. It cannot reach the thoughts of the heart. True, our laws rightly give weight to the thoughts where ascertained. For instance, the motive is always considered in the case of a man killing another. The state of the heart and feelings may decide whether that act shall be considered murder, manslaughter, or justifiable homicide. But it is the *act* that the law notices. Thought, simply as thought, cannot be punished. You may cherish the most unrighteous and horrible feelings and desires, but unless expressed in actionable words or criminal deeds, the law cannot deal with you. Evil thoughts cannot be punished, just as good thoughts cannot be prevented by law. So Lord Liverpool was reminded on one occasion, when a Nonconformist deputation waited upon him to plead for the removal of certain disabilities under which the missionaries suffered. His lordship said that 'he quite approved of liberty of thought in matters of religion.' 'Thank you for nothing, my lord,' said the gruff voice of sturdy Andrew Fuller; 'we do not wish for liberty *to think—that* you cannot give or take away; we ask for liberty to act.' That well illustrates the important truth that law humanly administered can only deal with the acts, and so when we find that the law of Moses, *as applied to the nation*, dealt mainly with the conduct, we ought not to assert that, on that account, it sanctioned low morality. That same law, as a Divine requirement applied to the individual conscience, did as really demand truth in the inward parts as does the Gospel. It demanded the love of the *heart*, the obedience of the soul; and not a little of the Old Testament teaching bears on the necessity of heart religion, and teaches that mere external worship is unacceptable formalism, and that the 'thought of wickedness is sin.'

It is worth noticing, also, that so far from the New Testament setting itself in opposition to the Old, it endorses the Old as a whole, and claims to be the outcome of it; and even some of the specific instances of alleged immorality are sanctioned by the New, as really and as fully as by the Old. For instance, we have the actions of Jacob and Rahab mentioned with approval. I do not say that the sinful element in those acts is approved, just as I do not think the sinful element is approved in the Old Testament; but the New Testament speaks of these acts in the very same way as the Old; and if anyone will affirm that the Old approves the sinfulness, he must cease to exalt the morality of the New at the expense of the Old, since it pronounces the same judgment. Even that crucial case which we have considered at length, which, perhaps more than any other, has been vaunted as the great instance of immoral procedure commanded in the Old Testament—viz., the extermination of the Canaanites, is fully endorsed and deliberately approved in the New Testament. In Stephen's speech we read, 'Our fathers entered on the possession of the nations which God thrust out before the face of our fathers.' Paul, in his address at Antioch, declares, 'When He had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, He gave them their land for an inheritance.' In the Epistle to the Hebrews, we read of the entrance into the land of promise under Joshua, who gave them rest, while in the eleventh chapter not only is the downfall of Jericho celebrated, but mention is also made of the exploits of the Judges, Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah. So that in no less than four passages the so-called immorality is justified and glorified in the New Testament.

3. *A third branch of the objection consists in pointing out the many immoralities recorded of good men, and alleging the immoral tendency of the realistic description of sin.* This need not detain us long. We generally find this form of the objection on the lips of blatant and boorish infidelity. Of course the simple answer to it is that these evil actions of good men are not recorded with approval and for imitation, but they are set forth as warnings, being either condemned or left without comment to speak their own condemnation. So far from this being an objection against Inspiration, it is a strong proof in its favour. Other writers generally gloss over or minimize the faults of their heroes; these inspired writers alone exhibit perfect impartiality. They scruple not to declare the drunkenness of Noah, the incest of Lot, the falsehood of Abraham, the passion of Moses, the lust of David. Their best characters are shown to be imperfect, and prove a practical commentary on the solemn truth, so characteristic of God's revelation, that 'All have sinned and come short of the glory of God.' It is a significant fact, too, that even where no opinion is expressed of the evil conduct recorded, the whole tone of the writing is in favour of righteousness, and the impression left upon the mind is that of abhorrence of the evil. They do not, like many writers, make vice attractive; they do not palliate it and excuse it because found in good men; they cast over it no glamour of sentimentality; it is painted in all its own ugliness. The same may be said in answer to the assertion that the Bible is an immoral book because of the plain terms in which it speaks of sin. It is said that some of its language is indelicate. Perhaps we might reply that indelicacy is a relative term. For instance, expressions

occur in Chaucer and Shakespeare reflecting the habits of speech in their times which would not be tolerated nowadays in refined society, and the plain outspokenness of the Bible may possibly shock the superfine feelings of some of the fastidious products of this wonderful age. But it is necessary sometimes that sin should be spoken of in plain terms. The Bible gives the knowledge of sin, and the loathsomeness of the thing is, to some extent, reflected in the language which describes it. I heard a preacher the other day, speaking of the necessity of dealing with certain forms of vice, say, 'Only the best men and women will dare to touch the worst men and women. And only the best Book in the world will dare to touch the worst forms of sin; the object in each case is the same, to save from sinning.' There is nothing in the Bible descriptions of sin to gratify a prurient imagination; the whole tendency is the reverse of immoral, as may be practically and conclusively shown by the actual result of Bible study. If the Bible were an immoral book, would it not be read and prized by immoral men? The drunkard and debauchee would make it their companion, the robber and murderer take it as their guide-book, and good men and women would shun it as a plague. The reverse is notoriously the truth. And wherever the Bible is loved and followed, there, and there only, you have pure morality. 'The Bible,' in the words of Joseph Cook, 'is the only book in the world that will bear full and permanent translation into life.' And, with him, we may say, 'I defy the world to show any disease that ever has come from the absorption into the veins of the ages of the Biblical inculcation. And, moreover, I defy the ages to show any other book that could be absorbed

thus in its inculcations, and not produce dizziness of the head, pimples on the skin, staggering at last, and the sowing of dragons' teeth.' No book of antiquity could stand the test that has been applied to the Bible. Go to India and see the result in the lives of the people of the teaching of their sacred books; think of the astounding immorality among the Greeks and Romans, largely due to the teaching of their religious leaders and writers. Look at the condition of men to-day in Roman Catholic countries where the Bible has been displaced by priestcraft and superstition, and then consider the moral tone and character of these lands where the Bible has freest scope, and you find an unanswerable confutation of the infidel sneer against the immorality of the Bible. If even the most moral writers among the Greeks had been as implicitly followed as the Bible, most disastrous would have been the consequences to true morality. To quote again from Cook: 'Plato taught such doctrine that if the world had followed him as it has the Bible, and had absorbed, not his account of men's vices, but his positive inculcation, we to-day should be living in barracks, and we could not know who are our brothers and who are our sisters.'

If the salutary influence of the Bible were to-day removed from England, and the people left to such moral teaching as the opponents of the Bible could supply, we should soon be left without enough moral light to make the darkness visible.

## LECTURE XII.

### ALLEGED INCORRECT HISTORICAL ALLUSIONS. — ALLEGED UNSCIENTIFIC STATEMENTS.

*A* *LLLEGED Incorrect Historical Allusions.*—Looked at simply as history, the Bible is the most wonderful of books. It covers a far larger period than any of the histories of antiquity, or all of them combined. It contains accounts of events nowhere else to be found. It records not simply the history of one people, but to a large extent of the race. It is written not by one author, but by many, and these living in different ages, yet the same tone characterizes all. It is superior to all the other ancient histories in every respect. It surpasses Herodotus in simplicity and vividness of narration, Xenophon in beauty of episode, Thucydides in philosophical and moral insight and reflectiveness. It is distinguished above all others for its lofty spiritual aim, and its intense moral character. Herodotus seeks to paint the greatness of the Hellenic race whether found in Europe or Asia; Xenophon is a panegyrist now of the famous 10.000 Greeks, now of Cyrus the Persian, or Agesilaus the Spartan; Thucydides shows the causes and course of the most important of internal Grecian wars: the grand aim of the Bible historians is to exalt God; throughout all the scenes of human life He is



shown to be the great actor; as we read, we feel that 'God in history' is no mere phrase, but a blessed reality. The other illustrious trio of historians sought by their works immortal fame for themselves, and ungrudgingly has it been given; but the Bible historians sink their own personality, efface themselves, so that we never think of the skilful writers, but of the immortal writing.

The Bible as history everywhere bears the impress of sobriety, truthfulness, candour, and thorough knowledge of facts, and is, to say the least, worthy of all the credit that we give to other reliable histories. We contend that even if a man disbelieve altogether in Inspiration, he ought yet to attach due weight to the Bible histories. It has been too much the habit to treat the Bible histories as less worthy of credit than profane histories. Where full corroboration is given by these to any Bible account, then the Bible is credited; but where no corroboration is forthcoming, and from the nature of the case not likely to be, then, however interesting the account may be, it is pooh-poohed, because it is only in the Bible. The Bible has in so many points where it touches secular history been found strictly accurate, that its reputation ought by this time to be fully established, so that its own testimony might be heartily accepted. It would be a congenial task to speak of the marvellous way in which the Bible narratives have ever been justified. Research has constantly been throwing light upon passages deemed obscure, and especially of late years through the deciphering of the Egyptian hieroglyphics and the translation of the cuneiform inscriptions of Babylon and Nineveh. Many events which were formerly the subject of the sceptic's

sneer have been shown to have a real historical basis outside the Bible. For instance, the expedition of the confederate kings against Sodom and Gomorrah is now shown to be a true picture of the times; names very like Chederlaomer, Arioch, etc., are found on the inscriptions, and similar kinds of raids, if not this identical one, against the south of Palestine are depicted. So also the Egyptian records strikingly confirm the story of Genesis and Exodus; the whole colouring of the sacred narrative in its relation to Egyptian affairs is thoroughly Egyptian, and could only have been the product of a writer familiar with the Egyptian life of those times. The name given to Joseph in Egypt, which has so long puzzled Hebrew scholars, is now shown to be a characteristically Egyptian name. In the annals of the Kings, while it is not to be expected that a confession of the overthrow which attended the Exodus would be given, there is found a significant blank corresponding to that dread disaster. In exact agreement with the account in Exodus, there is a record of the death of the firstborn son of Menephtah, who has been identified by competent scholars as the Pharaoh of the Exodus; and while the mummies of Rameses II., the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and his predecessors, have been found, there is no mummy of Menephtah. In Kings and Chronicles many allusions are made to Assyrian and Babylonian monarchs, and now that the annals of these kings have become accessible, it is found that they are full of references to Israel and Judah and the neighbouring kingdom of Syria. The familiar names of Tiglath Pileser, Sennacherib, Sargon, and Esarhaddon are met with constantly, and so are the names of Menahem, Jehu, Hezekiah,

Hazael of Syria, Manasseh, Zedekiah. Accounts of invasions of Palestine, exacting of tribute, of transportation of the inhabitants, abound in these clay volumes, and bear out to the full the statements of the inspired historian. Many of these matters have in former times been the subject of doubt or denial by the opponents of Scripture, and some still are questioned. In not a few cases the first reading of the inscriptions seemed to charge the Bible narrative with inaccuracy, but fuller and more exact research has removed that impression. A few specific instances may be mentioned. The existence of Pul, the Assyrian monarch, to whom Menahem, King of Israel, paid tribute, had been denied altogether, as the known Assyrian records made no mention of him, but now from more recent discoveries he is clearly identified with Tiglath Pileser. The inscriptions, while confirming the Bible account of the relations between Hezekiah and Sennacherib, disclosed a discrepancy in regard to the amount of tribute paid by the King of Judah; but later researches have harmonized both accounts, showing that there was a different standard of value, so that the 300 talents in the Jewish reckoning were equivalent to the 800 of the Assyrians.

The case of the destruction of Sennacherib's army has of course been scouted as incredible. There is no direct confirmation of this event in the Assyrian annals, nor is that to be wondered at, since the monarchs generally record only their great deeds and constantly glorify themselves. Sennacherib's language throughout is in the boastful strain which is ascribed to him in the Bible. But some indirect evidence of the truth of the sacred narrative is found in the fact that while the vain-glorious monarch speaks of exacting

the tribute from Hezekiah, and of shutting him up 'like a bird in a cage in Jerusalem, his royal city,' he does not say that he captured the city; he cannot conceal the fact that he did not succeed in punishing Hezekiah and his city as he had punished other cities and kings who had revolted against him. He tells of no further campaign in Palestine, but carries his arms elsewhere. Surely there was some reason for all this. Judging from his conduct on other occasions, he would never have rested till he had wreaked his vengeance upon his disobedient vassal, and it is fair to infer that he did not venture into Palestine again because of the terrible disaster which there befell him. In the circumstances, the very silence of the vaunter is strong presumptive evidence in favour of the Bible account. In the twentieth of Isaiah there is a passage which has been a difficulty to many. 'In the year that Tartan came into Ashdod (when Sargon, the King of Assyria, sent him) and fought against Ashdod and took it.' In Kings we read of Tartan being sent against Jerusalem by Sennacherib, but nothing of this campaign. The tablets, however, reveal the fact that Tartan was an official title for the commander-in-chief, so that Sennacherib and Sargon could both send a Tartan, and one of the inscriptions furnishes a most exact confirmation of this passage in Isaiah, for it states that Sargon (who was the father of Sennacherib) besieged and captured Ashdod. Sargon also claims to have overrun and conquered 'the wide-spreading land of Judah,' and it is now very probable that the Assyrian invasion which is described in the twentieth of Isaiah, was the invasion under Sargon, though it has by some been referred to Sennacherib; while others, unable so to understand it, have looked upon it as an ideal picture by

the prophet. The twenty-second chapter may also refer to the same time. This view is confirmed by the fact that the Assyrian conqueror in the tenth of Isaiah boasts of taking Calno and Carchemish, Hamath and Arpad, Damascus and Samaria. Inscriptions show that these were taken by Sargon.

In 2 Kings xvii. Shalmanezzer is represented as the conqueror of Samaria, but it would seem that though he did begin the work, it was completed by Sargon. Indeed, the inscriptions show that during the siege Shalmanezzer died, and the supreme power was seized by one of his generals, who then assumed the name of Sargon. Now in the light of this fact, read the account in Kings. We are told that 'against him (Hoshea) Shalmanezzer, King of Assyria, came up.' Again, 'The King of Assyria came up throughout all the land, and went up to Samaria and besieged it three years; in the ninth year of Hoshea, the King of Assyria took Samaria.' Now mark, the personal name of the king is not again given throughout the narrative; it is intimated that Shalmanezzer was the king who came up to besiege the city, but the King of Assyria who took the city was Sargon; the *official* was the same, the *personal* character was changed; and a hint of this is given in the next chapter, where the siege being again mentioned, we read of Shalmanezzer, King of Assyria, besieging the city, and at the end of three years, it is not said he took it, but '*they took it*'; and considering that it is always the action of the king, not the people, that is celebrated, it is not unreasonable to find in the expression '*they took it*' an allusion to the two kings who were concerned in the matter.

One more instance of the accuracy of the Old Testament,

in a matter where inaccuracy has been, and even yet is, freely charged against it, may be given. I refer to the account in Daniel of the capture of Babylon. Both Herodotus and Xenophon give an account of that event, and show that Cyrus took the city by cutting off the waters of the Euphrates and entering under the walls by the channel of the river, a fact that had been predicted by the sacred writers. So far there is harmony, but the secular accounts say nothing of King Belshazzar, but give the king's name as Nabonidus and Labynetus. Here, then, says the objector, is one contradiction. An apologist might be tempted to say that as these other two names are given to the king, possibly Belshazzar was also one of his names; but here another difficulty arose. The account of Berosus, quoted by Josephus, states that the king assembled his forces and met Cyrus some distance from Babylon, and, being defeated, fled to the city of Borsippa, and that Cyrus afterwards captured that city, treated the king with great kindness, and appointed him a residence in Carmania, where he died. How could the Bible account be reconciled with these statements? The suggested explanations of expositors were scouted, and it was contended that the Book of Daniel was historically worthless. Now what do we find? Cylinders have been discovered containing accounts, both by Nabonidus and by Cyrus, of the capture of Babylon. The points already mentioned as to the defeat and capture of the king are confirmed; but there is something more. We learn now that Nabonidus had a son, that he had admitted that son to a share in the government, that the son commanded the forces in Babylon, and, what is of immense importance, the name of the son was



*Belshazzar.* With these facts it is easy to explain the narrative in Daniel. Belshazzar, as Governor of Babylon and partner of his father's throne, could legitimately be called King of Babylon; that he was not absolute sovereign is hinted in the twenty-ninth verse of the fifth chapter, where Daniel is proclaimed 'the *third* ruler in the kingdom.' According to the analogy in the case of Joseph and Mordecai, who were raised to a position *next* to the king, we should have expected that Daniel would have been made second ruler in the kingdom; we now see why that could not be: Belshazzar himself was second, and Daniel, made next to him, could only be third. In other points the sacred narrative is confirmed by the profane historians; both Herodotus and Xenophon assert that the city was taken by *night during a festival*, and Xenophon so far departs from the account of Berosus as to say that 'the godless king then perished.' There is one other point upon which confirmation is yet lacking, but judging from the way in which other details have been substantiated, we are fully warranted in believing that the Bible account is true, viz., that Darius the Mede seems to have been the chief actor on the occasion, and that he 'took the kingdom.' Some have supposed that he was Cyaxares II., the uncle of Cyrus, who was King of the Medes, but who allowed his more enterprising nephew to take the chief part in the affairs of the kingdom; others that he may have been a viceroy appointed by Cyrus. The expression, 'took the kingdom,' may indicate receiving it as a delegated authority from someone else. One significant statement is made on the tablets to the effect that the army of Cyrus which took Babylon was commanded by Gobryas, the Governor of

Kurdistan—‘they entered without fighting, on the sixteenth of June, and, on the third day of October, *Cyrus* entered Babylon.’ Here, then, there is room for the appointment of another ruler to manage affairs meanwhile. May not this be the reason why *Cyrus* does not prominently appear in Daniel’s account? In any case it is true that the rule of *Cyrus* was the rule of Medes and Persians, and that Daniel was quite aware of *Cyrus*’s part in this matter is clear from the sixth chapter, twenty-eighth verse: ‘So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of *Cyrus* the Persian.’ Again I say that when the account is correct in all the details where verification is possible, we may well refuse to reject any part, although as yet it may lack full confirmation from external sources.

I can only briefly refer to three instances of supposed inaccuracy in the New Testament. In Luke ii. 1 we read, ‘And it came to pass in those days that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed (and this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria).’ Here it is declared we have a glaring inaccuracy; for, first, no other author mentions such a general census; and, second, Josephus shows that Quirinius was not Governor of Syria until about ten years after the birth of Christ. Now, on the face of it, we might suppose, apart altogether from the question of Inspiration, that Luke had a more thorough knowledge of the affairs of his own time than to fall into such a mistake on a matter of so great importance, especially when he assures us that he had a perfect understanding of all the things about which he writes, or, in the words of the Rev. Ver., ‘Having traced the course of all things accurately from the first.’ With

regard to the first objection, it has been shown from a comparison of the profane historians that Augustus did indeed order and seek to carry out a general system of taxation throughout the Empire. As to the second point, it is possible to reconcile Luke's statement with the fact that Cyrenius was Governor of Syria ten years later, by a slightly different rendering of the passage. As in the Rev. Ver., 'This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was Governor of Syria,' *i. e.*, the decree, though issued then, was accomplished in the days of Quirinius, or more literally, giving the same meaning, 'this enrolment *became* (or took effect) *first* when Quirinius was Governor of Syria.' Other renderings I need not stay to mention, since it is of more importance to note that a distinguished scholar has shown that there is room for the insertion of another name in the list of governors of Syria, that, indeed, there is a blank in the history of Josephus for this period which needs to be filled up; and he shows from Tacitus that when young Caius Cæsar was sent to govern the province of Armenia, Quirinius was appointed as his rector; this must have been at least earlier than A. D. 4, since Caius died in that year, and indeed, the date given for the appointment of Caius is A. D. 1. Now, mark the important item, the reason why Quirinius was sent with Caius was because of the renown he had previously acquired by certain exploits in *Cilicia*. But it is believed that at that time Syria was united with Cilicia under one governor. Quirinius seems, then, to have been Governor of Cilicia, for before he had been consul, and so it is almost demonstrated that he was, at the birth of Christ (four years before the received date of A. D. 1), Governor of Syria, and this important fact is accurately recorded in the pages of Luke's history.

Luke has also been charged with historical inaccuracy in the report he gives of Gamaliel's speech (Acts v. 36). He represents Gamaliel as speaking of two insurrections, one under Theudas, and another, at a later date, under Judas. Josephus mentions the insurrection under Judas, and he also speaks of one under *Theudas*, but the latter took place in the reign of Claudius, some ten years after the time of Gamaliel's speech. Immediately it is concluded that Luke has been guilty of an anachronism in referring to the case of Theudas; but surely Luke knew his facts as well as Josephus knew his, and there is no reason whatever to suppose that he is referring to the same Theudas, for Josephus himself mentions that there were many other 'risings' among the people, while omitting to give the names of the leaders, and since Theudas was a common name among the Jews, it is easy to believe that another Theudas led a revolt before the time of Judas. This is the generally accepted explanation among expositors, and yet we find Dr. Horton bringing forward this instance as a proof of Luke's inaccuracy, and *giving no hint* of the way in which it has been explained. In a footnote, indeed, he refers to the attempt of a certain writer to prove that Luke must have had the passage in Josephus before him which speaks of the two risings, and that, therefore, a later date must be assigned to the composition of the Acts. Dr. Horton rightly rejects that theory, and in doing so he asks this pertinent question, 'Is it not fair to assume that if St. Luke had read the passage of Josephus, he would not have made the blunder of putting Theudas before Judas, and the anachronism of ascribing the reference to Gamaliel on this occasion?' But yet he considers that Luke does commit such an anachronism,

although surely he must have known, not from the then unwritten page of Josephus, but from the *talk of his own time*, that the Theudas of Claudius's day lived not before, but after the Judas of the 'enrolment.' Dr. Horton knows all about Luke's feelings. He says, 'If someone . . . had pointed out to him that Theudas was later than the time of Gamaliel's speech, he would have unhesitatingly corrected his mistake, as he did his impression about the Ascension.' What does that last clause mean, do you say? It means that Dr. Horton, in an earlier page of his book, has proved to his own satisfaction that when Luke wrote his Gospel he thought the Ascension took place on the very day of the Resurrection; but when he wrote the Acts of the Apostles 'he was better informed,' and 'in the simplest and most natural way *he corrects himself*.' I think it will be anything but a simple matter to find any trace of such a 'correction' in the opening verses of Acts. Luke there affirms the credibility of his first treatise and proceeds to give a fuller account of the Ascension, and he must read the two accounts with strange eyes who does not see that the compressed statement in the Gospel is not inaccurate, and that the subsequent expansion is no correction. Especially offensive is such a suggestion in view of Luke's own claim to have traced out the course of all things accurately from the first. So that even if some will deny his accuracy in regard to matters outside the Gospel story, they might surely admit that, as to the matters of fact in that story itself, he knew what he was writing about.

The other New Testament instance I give is also from the writings of Luke. In the thirteenth of Acts, mention is made of Sergius Paulus, Governor of Cyprus. The title

Luke gives him is Proconsul (*Anthupatos*). Now here was for a long time a difficulty. The rulers of the provinces which were directly under the jurisdiction of the Emperor were called Proprætors. The provinces under the control of the Senate were governed by *Proconsuls*. Augustus, at the first division of provinces, reserved Cyprus for himself, and therefore the title of the governor would be 'Proprætor.' Well, after all, it is a small matter; but the accuracy of Luke in the smallest detail has been triumphantly vindicated, for coins have been found in Cyprus of the date of Claudius with this very title, 'Proconsul,' while a passage has been found in the pages of Dion Cassius to the effect that Augustus surrendered Cyprus and Gallia Narbonensis to the Senate; and he adds, 'So it came to pass that *Proconsuls* began to be sent to these nations also.' There are many other instances of a like fidelity to facts on the part of Luke, so that again we say, that even in regard to passages which may yet be without external corroboration, we are well warranted to trust a historian who has been shown to be so generally reliable.

We have next to consider the objection that in the Bible there are many *Unscientific Statements* which are inconsistent with full inspiration. Now, it must be recognised on all hands that the Bible is not given to teach science, and in the strict use of the term, it is not a *scientific book*. Still, we expect that in an inspired book, when scientific matters are mentioned, the allusions will not be marked with error. At the same time, it is likely that natural phenomena will be described in popular language intelligible to the people of that day. Now, we hold that is what we do find—an absence of actual error, a popular



description of scientific facts, and often a hint of matters which were left to be fully discovered by science of later ages. As to the use of popular language, it is enough to observe, that when the Bible speaks of the sun rising and setting, travelling, running a race, etc., it no more proclaims, as a scientific fact, that the sun goes round the earth, than the same language on the lips of an astronomer of the present day proves him to be an opponent of the Copernican system. The most advanced scientists still speak of sunrise and sunset, and no doubt will continue so to do. And yet many of the objections levelled against the Bible have been founded upon this mode of speech. Then, again, much of the language of Scripture is poetical, and ought in all fairness to be interpreted in the same way as other poetry. Now, as to any actual conflict between Scripture and true science, we deny its presence. I have heard the matter well put years ago, by Dr. Sinclair Patterson, somewhat in this way: Theology is men's opinion concerning the facts of Revelation; Science is men's opinion about the facts of Nature; there may be conflict between Theology and Science in this sense, *i. e.*, between men's interpretation of the facts of revelation, and their interpretation of the facts of Nature, but there can be no contradiction between the facts of Revelation and the facts of Nature, for God is the Author of both. This being so, we ought not to be anxious to reconcile the Bible with every decision of science. We must first know whether the scientists have rightly interpreted the facts before we talk of an adjustment.

This, I think, applies to the contention of geologists concerning the first chapter of Genesis; not all geologists, we are thankful to admit, for some of the most distinguished

of them have vindicated the accuracy of the Mosaic record. It is not necessary for me to discuss the various schemes of reconciliation which have been elaborated, whether we are, with Hugh Miller and others, to take the days of Creation as geological periods; or, with Chalmers, to place all the geological changes between the first and second verses, and take the rest of the chapter as dealing with the rearrangement of earth to be the abode of men; or, with Mr. Gladstone, to treat these days neither as literal days, nor as geological periods, but simply after the analogy of literary divisions into chapters—*chapters in the history of creation*, setting forth different series of creative facts, which need not find a parallel in geological epochs. The very fact that so many different plans are possible shows the pregnancy of the Scriptural account; and so long as there is even a possibility of harmonizing it with the findings of geology, it is surely worthy of respect. This is the more significant when we consider that all other ancient theories of creation have been exploded, utterly annihilated, laughed out of existence, by the discoveries of modern science. The Bible account alone stands the scientific test. Still, let us remember that science has not spoken the last word on this subject, and it has already frequently had to modify its conclusions, and, perhaps, when it has finally settled this article of its creed, it may itself be compelled to admit that the Bible is right after all, and has been right all along. As one has said, it is much easier to reconcile the first chapter of Genesis with geology, than it is to reconcile the last edition of Lyell's 'Geology' with the first edition.

What shall we say of the much-vaunted doctrine of evolution? Can the Bible be reconciled with that? There

are some who think so, especially evolution within certain limits. But I am of the opinion that in this matter any attempt at reconciliation is premature, inasmuch as, at the very least, the Scotch verdict of '*Not proven*' must be given against Evolution. In spite of the fact that the doctrine is so fashionable, that our pulpits are tinged and tainted with it, that our religious magazines are saturated with it; in spite even of the fact that Professor Drummond has lent the weight of his confessedly great authority to it, I fail to see that the doctrine has been established. Thoroughgoing evolution must include *spontaneous generation*; and all the tall talk about natural selection, transmutation of species, survival of the fittest, influence of environment, must not blind us to the fact that no scientist of repute will dare to assert that *spontaneous generation* has been proved; that life can spring from the non-living. Still does the confession of Huxley stand, that between the two there is a great gulf fixed. I have not seen that in all his recent lectures Professor Drummond touched upon this point, the full significance of which he has clearly and eloquently shown in 'Natural Law in the Spiritual World.' Still it remains true in Nature as in mathematics that evolution must equal *involution*. You can only evolve what has been involved. We know that an oak may be evolved from an acorn, but the life of the oak was from the first involved in the acorn. We know that a bird, a beast, a man can be evolved from their respective *ova*, but all the potencies of the life of each were originally wrapped up in that *ovum*, and according to the laws of each has the development taken place. In the present stage of Evolution, then, it is admitted that life always precedes life, which is simply a phase of the old

axiom, that every effect must have an adequate cause, and we fancy that evolutionists will wait a long time before that axiom becomes obsolete.

The Bible has also been held to contradict the science of *Ethnology*—so much the worse for *Ethnology*. *Ethnology* has asserted that it was impossible that all the different races of human beings could have sprung from one stock. The Bible shows that they do, not only the Old Testament, with its pictures of the origin of the race from one man, and the dispersion of the three families after the Flood, but the New Testament, with its doctrine of the solidarity of the race in Adam, and its sublime declaration, ‘God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell upon the face of the earth.’ There is now a disposition on the part of ethnologists to approximate to the Biblical position, and confirmation of the Bible accounts has been furnished by the Chaldean tablets.

The science of *Philology*, which at one time lent its support to the anti-Scriptural ethnological theories, is also veering round to the Scriptural standpoint. All the known languages have been resolved into three great families; the *Indo-European*, the *Semitic*, and the *Turanian* (though other names are suggested by some), while there is a strong feeling that at the basis of all three lies one original language. As to the subdivisions and ethnic varieties given in the tenth chapter of Genesis, which have been often treated as hopelessly obscure and worthless, in many respects opposed to ascertained facts, further research in the light of modern knowledge has fully vindicated that marvellous chapter.

*Natural history* has often been drawn upon for illustration by the sacred writers, and it is asserted that in many cases

they have misunderstood the facts. Further examination, however, has so often justified their statements, that where there is a seeming error we hesitate to admit it, but are rather disposed to charge the fault upon our own ignorance. I can only allude to one instance. In Prov. vi. 7, 8, it is said that 'the ant provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest,' and in the thirtieth chapter, 'The ants are a people not strong, yet they provide their meat in the summer.' The meaning evidently is that the writer considered that the ants stored up food in summer for *winter consumption*. It is contended that this is an egregious blunder, and is simply an expression of the common but erroneous notion that ants do thus store their food. The difficulty is thus put: 'Modern Science has shown that ants do not live on grain, but on flesh, insects, and the sweet sap or other exudations of trees, which could not be stored for winter use; and, moreover, they sleep during winter in all but very hot climates.' Now it might be a sufficient answer to say that Solomon speaks according to the popular notion, and that his illustration would therefore be appropriate and forcible. But I think there is a more satisfactory answer. Sir John Lubbock has shown in his fascinating book on 'Ants, Bees, and Wasps,' that in many places ants do not hibernate, and that they do actually prepare and lay up stores of food for the winter. He says, this is true of the ants in the warmer parts of Europe, and I have heard our late beloved President say that he had often watched them in Mentone. Sir John also shows that certain species of them do live on grain; indeed, he gives a remarkable instance of the providence of ants in Texas. He declares that they will clear a patch of ground, sow it

with ant rice (or, at least, if the rice is self-sown, they allow nothing else to grow with it), watch the plants as they grow to maturity, and when ripe gather in the harvest and store it. The question now is, do the ants in Palestine store their food, and do they live on grain? Dr. Geikie contends that they do not; but Dr. Thomson, who has had better opportunities of studying them than even Dr. Geikie, maintains that they do. He has often watched them carrying away the grain in great quantities. Dr. Geikie says they only take seeds and grains, etc., to line their nest; it is hard to believe that, in face of Dr. Thomson's statement about thousands of ants constantly hurrying along laden with grain, and that 'the farmer must keep a sharp eye to his floor in harvest, or they will abstract a large quantity of grain in a single night.' Mr. James Neil, who has also spent many years in Palestine, supports Dr. Thomson's view. Dr. Geikie is obliged, moreover, to admit that it is not certain that in Palestine ants do hibernate (*i. e.*, sleep during winter); he has himself seen them moving about even in January in the district of the Dead Sea. I think, then, we may conclude that Solomon was perfectly right in his science, and that had the sluggard taken his advice and considered the ways of the ant even as carefully as the most acute of modern scientists, he would not have been able to return to the wise man and tell him that he was quite mistaken, for the ants did not provide their meat in the summer nor gather their food in the harvest.

Many of you have been studying *Physiology*; well, if you take up some of the ancient books, you will be amused at the physiological ideas you will there find, even in such an intelligent author as Plato, but you will find no such



blunders in the Bible. You will rather find some wonderful anticipations of modern physiological discoveries, as, for instance, in the last chapter of Ecclesiastes, that scientifically accurate, though beautifully figurative description, of the Circulation of the Blood.

I cannot stop to show how in many cases the ceremonial laws of Moses anticipate and harmonize with the modern developments of Sanitary science and Hygiene. I linger but a little on the Science of Astronomy, 'perhaps the eldest of the sciences.' The alleged contradictions founded on the popular or poetic style of speech we have already indicated; it is more to the purpose to note how wondrously the Bible has anticipated the discoveries of modern astronomy. How comes it that, while the Copernican system of astronomy has overturned all the ancient ideas, while it has shown how scientifically worthless are the sacred books of the Hindus, Parsees, and Mohammedans, it has left the Bible untouched? How comes it that while other nations held that the sky above was a solid vault studded with stars, the Bible described it as an *expanse* dividing between the waters above and the waters beneath? How is it that, while other systems of philosophy and theology held that the earth was a plain and rested upon various supports, the Bible could tell that it was a globe, a circle, and that it was hung upon nothing? Surely there is something manifestly Divine in all this!

Several other instances of Scripture anticipations of modern discoveries in astronomy might be given, but I have only space for one, which may be considered the most remarkable. In the Book of Job, God is represented as asking, 'Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?'

referring to that beautiful constellation of the 'seven stars.' Dr. Macmillan has an intensely interesting chapter on this in his 'Bible Teachings in Nature,' to which I would refer you for a full account, while I give the substance of it. Astronomers having come to the conclusion that as the planets revolve round the sun, so the whole solar system revolves round some central orb, endeavoured to discover that centre, and at last 'M. Mädler, of Dorpat, found that Alcyone, the brightest star of the Pleiades, is the centre of gravity of our vast solar system—the luminous *hinge* in the heavens round which our sun and his attendant planets are moving through space.' The significant fact is that the Hebrew word *Chimah*, rendered Pleiades, means a *pivot*, or *hinge*! Well may Dr. Macmillan, after showing that our solar system is carried round this centre—though its distance from it is thirty-four million times greater than the distance between the sun and our earth—at the rate of 422,000 miles a day, say: 'With this new explanation, how remarkably striking and appropriate does the original word for Pleiades appear! What a lofty significance does the question of the Almighty receive from this interpretation! "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?" Canst thou arrest, or in any degree modify that attractive influence which it exerts upon our sun and all its planetary worlds, whirling them round its pivot in an orbit of such inconceivable dimensions, and with a velocity so utterly bewildering? Silence the most profound can be the only answer to such a question. Man can but stand afar off, and in awful astonishment and profound humility, exclaim with the Psalmist, "O Lord my God, Thou art very great!"

## LECTURE XIII.

### ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES AND CONTRADICTIONS.

THESE various objections which we have been considering lie against the Bible as an Inspired Book. They come in many cases from infidels who repudiate the Book altogether. But they come also from those who, accepting it as an Inspired Book, consider that these objections lie only against some particular theory of Inspiration. They are, indeed, considered as objections mainly to the theory which we as a College hold—the Plenary and Verbal Inspiration of Scripture. It seems to me that they must apply to every theory which admits any Inspiration worthy of the name. Those holding the naturalistic theory, which attributes to the Bible writers only the same kind of Inspiration which is ascribed to Shakespeare or Milton, Goethe or Dante, Byron or Shelley, will, of course, not consider that these objections, if entertained, constitute any difficulty; but assuredly such Inspiration falls very far short of the Biblical idea. Dr. Horton's theory, that Inspiration is attached to the facts, of which the Scripture writers give an account, may also escape the difficulties suggested, but it is open to the great difficulty, that it regards them as no more inspired than any ordinary historian. If Inspiration attaches only to the facts—*i. e.*, to certain facts, for many of the facts recorded in

Scripture are, according to the theory, destitute of the quality—then Josephus, who records God's wondrous dealings with Israel, and Tacitus, who reports the crucifixion of Christ under Pontius Pilate, are inspired in the same way as Moses and the Evangelists. If Dr. Horton were as acute in thinking as he is ornate in writing, he might suspect that there is a very glaring incongruity, an utter confusion of thought, in attributing inspiration to a *fact* or *event*. The holders of the theory of partial inspiration, among whom we must, it seems, reckon Dr. Clifford, throw such difficulties in our teeth, and think their own theory free from the pressure of them. But I consider that if the objections had any force, they would tell equally against the partial theory. According to that theory, only portions of the Scripture are inspired; but these portions, they say, are plenarily, and in some cases even verbally inspired. Now, how are these portions to be discriminated? If they refused Inspiration to any book in which these alleged difficulties occur, we could understand their consistency, and respect their logic; but they do not. They wish to assure us that the portions of particular books which are marred by these inaccuracies are to be treated as uninspired, but that inspiration still attaches to the remaining portions. Now, I think it will be found that these objectionable parts are not generally of the nature of excrescences, which may be cut off and leave the body of the matter unimpaired; they are part and parcel of the very tissues of the sacred story; and the moral truth and teaching will generally be found inseparably linked with them. So, too, with regard to the theory that used to be considered the rival to the Plenary and Verbal theory, viz., that which holds the inspiration of the thought

of Scripture, but not of the language. By the way, I begin to wonder if that theory has many supporters among our modern teachers. When opposing the verbal theory, they seem to hold to it; but when expressing their own thoughts about Inspiration, it seems to recede into the background. But in any case, the theory as a theory is as hardly pressed by these objections as our theory. Are there faulty representations of God? then the fault is surely not simply in the expression, but in the conception. Are there immoralities countenanced or approved? Surely these immoralities are not a matter of words, but of thoughts. Again, are there historical inaccuracies? did Daniel make a mistake in his account of the fall of Babylon? and Luke in his description of the Census? then, unquestionably the mistake was not a slip of the pen, but an erroneous conception of the whole matter. So with these scientific difficulties; if the Sacred writers can be convicted of blundering so grievously, the blunder is not of word only, but essentially of thought. Nor does the theory of degrees of Inspiration escape the burden of the difficulties. Of course, that theory itself admits of so many degrees, that it is not easy to know where any particular advocate of it stands. But taking the generally accepted statement of it, we cannot see how actual errors can be consistent with it. If these alleged errors were only found in the portions to which is attributed the lowest degree of Inspiration, it might be said that it is the characteristic of that degree to admit of such errors; but when they are found in connection with what is reckoned the highest degree, what shall we say? It has generally been admitted, by these theorists, that in the Gospels, Inspiration rises to its loftiest

pitch; but it is exactly in the Gospels where some of them find the largest number of so-called mistakes. It is admitted that 'many of the addresses of the prophets were *plenarily* Inspired;' but in the wonderful address of Samuel, who was so distinguished a prophet, and who, on that occasion, so manifestly spake with the Divine approval, that in answer to his appeal, the Lord sent thunder and rain, an 'irreconcilable' discrepancy has been discovered by a believer in the Degree theory!

I think it is well to bear these considerations in mind when we hear Scripture difficulties spoken of in the strain that is fashionable in certain quarters, as if only those who believe in Plenary and Verbal Inspiration should be asked to crack these sceptical nuts. Let it be clearly understood that we have no more to do with them than any other believers in Inspiration. This applies with even more force to the next objection which we proceed to notice — *The Alleged Discrepancies and Contradictions of Scripture.*

That there are apparent Discrepancies and Contradictions we must admit, and it is quite possible that we may not be able satisfactorily to explain them all to others, or even to ourselves, but it does not follow that they cannot be explained. When we meet with seeming discrepancies in other writers, we try to find some way of explaining them without charging the author with inaccuracy, especially if he has shown himself generally trustworthy. With regard to many matters in ancient history which cannot be satisfactorily explained, we suppose that if other facts were known to us, the difficulties would be cleared away. But, unfortunately, it is the habit of many to treat the Scriptures in exactly the reverse way. They magnify the



difficulties; they ignore or reject all attempts at explanation; they jump at once to the conclusion that the writers are mistaken. Now, surely this is most unscientific. If it is possible to find a way of explaining the difficulty, we are bound to do so; and if, after all, we are not sure that the difficulty is removed, we surely ought, in view of the general trustworthiness of the Bible historians, to believe that if we knew other facts, which are now hidden from us, all would be clear. For instance, how strange must that prophecy of Ezekiel's concerning Zedekiah have appeared: 'I will bring him to Babylon, to the land of the Chaldeans, yet shall he not see it, though he shall die there.' How easy it would be to say there was some mistake here, especially when, in Jer. xxxii. 4, it is prophesied that Zedekiah 'shall be delivered into the hands of the King of Babylon, and shall speak with him mouth to mouth, and *his eyes shall behold his eyes.*' Of course in Jer. lii. 11 we have the full explanation, 'Then he *put out the eyes* of Zedekiah; and the king of Babylon bound him in chains, and carried him to Babylon, and put him in prison till the day of his death.' But if that simple fact had been omitted from the story, what a glaring discrepancy there would have been! Similarly, we may conclude that in other cases the presence of some additional fact would put the matter in a different light.

Suppose that a hundred years hence a number of letters written by different people to friends in India should be found. In one the writer tells that the great preacher, C. H. Spurgeon, was lying at the point of death at his residence at Norwood, London. In another mention is made of the lamented death of that world-famed preacher at Mentone, South of France. Suppose no date is given,

or given only in one, how inconsistent the two accounts would seem! Further, there might be in one letter the statement that the writer had attended the funeral service of Mr. Spurgeon, at Mentone, on Thursday, February 4; in another, that the funeral service was held at the Tabernacle, on Thursday, early in February. There might be another letter in which the writer said he had attended a service in connection with Mr. Spurgeon's funeral on Wednesday morning; one mentioning the service as held on Wednesday afternoon; another as being on Wednesday evening, at seven o'clock; while yet another might assert that the service was held on Wednesday night, at 10.30. Each of these might give the names of those who officiated at the service, most of which would be different, while a few would coincide; and, to crown all, yet another letter might simply describe the funeral service at Norwood Cemetery. Now, anyone reading these letters, and having no other source of information concerning the death and funeral of Mr. Spurgeon, might well think the various accounts inconsistent, perplexing, contradictory. It would be easy for another to assert that some of the writers had made mistakes; and anyone who would sit down and, patiently piecing together the different hints, construct a consistent narrative, showing every particular statement to be perfectly true and harmonious with the others, might be laughed at for his pains; and yet his conclusion would be the right one. So, we say, with regard to the seeming inconsistencies in the Scripture narratives. We believe in the perfect truth of all the statements, and, where it is not misconception of the related facts, it must be our ignorance of some unrelated facts that causes even the semblance of

contradiction; did we fully know all the particulars no disharmony would remain. The very fact that explanations can be suggested which reconcile all the alleged discrepancies should make anyone slow to affirm that they are irreconcilable. Any particular explanation given may not be the correct one, but that there is a correct one we cannot doubt. Bearing this in mind, let us note a few of the alleged discrepancies.

A very noticeable discrepancy is alleged between the two lists of the names of Esau's wives. In Gen. xxvi. 34, the two Canaanitish wives are called *Judith*, the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and *Bashemath*, the daughter of Elon the Hittite; in chapter xxviii. 9, the name of the third is given as *Mahalath*, the daughter of Ishmael. But in chapter xxxvi. 2, 3, the names appear '*Adah*, the daughter of Elon the Hittite, and *Aholibamah*, the daughter of *Anah*' (R.V. mar., the son), '*the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite, and Bashemath*, Ishmael's daughter.' There is perfect agreement, at least as to the facts that there were *three* wives, and that *two* were Canaanites, while one was the daughter of Ishmael. It was a common custom for both men and women to have two or more names, as very many instances in Scripture show, the names often being changed in commemoration of some event in the life, and even at the present day, in the East, women frequently change their names on the occasion of their marriage. Bashemath and Mahalath, then, are evidently two names borne by Ishmael's daughter; and, as both lists agree in representing one of the wives as the daughter of Elon the Hittite, there is no difficulty in considering that she bore both names of Adah and Bashemath. The remaining one is beset with the further difficulty that

the father's name is also differently given. In the one passage she is called the daughter of Beerî; in the other daughter of Anah, daughter of Zibeon. In chapter xxxvi. 24, Anah is clearly shown to be the *son* of Zibeon, so that 'daughter' in the second verse must be taken as referring to Aholibamah, and in its more general sense of descendant (here equal to grand-daughter) of Zibeon. Then *Beerî* may be taken as *another* name of Anah, and, as has been suggested, it may have been given him because of the incident recorded in the twenty-fourth verse, of his finding the 'hot springs' in the wilderness. It has also been suggested that 'daughter' in both clauses of the second verse should be taken in the meaning of descendant, and the woman be considered daughter of Beerî, grand-daughter of Anah, great grand-daughter of Zibeon. Possibly other facts, if known, would give a different solution; but we have no right to assume a mistake on the part of the writer when an explanation is possible. On the supposition that Moses or any other author wrote both portions of Genesis, it could not reasonably be contended that he would deliberately contradict himself. And, on the supposition of the Higher Critics, that we have two different and opposing accounts pieced together by a Redactor, it is equally unreasonable to think that any sensible man would permit such contradictions to go forth unexplained. The Critics say the accounts are so contradictory that they could not have proceeded from one pen, and yet they represent the Redactor as deliberately taking the one passage from one narrative, and the other from another, and joining them together thus, without any suspicion that there is a difficulty.

It is held that there is a discrepancy in the account of the

selling of Joseph by his brethren, Gen. xxxvii.; according to one verse, the traders to whom he was sold were Ishmaelites; according to another, Midianites. But surely it is mere quibbling to call this a discrepancy. Either the company consisted of Ishmaelites and Midianites, and they are named indifferently from either section, or, being Ishmaelites by race, are called Midianites because of their profession, 'merchantmen,' as ancient monuments show that the Arabians were in the habit of thus trading with Egypt. The Higher Critics have made much of this incident, as proving that two accounts are interwoven, but any unprejudiced reader will find it hard to believe that the whole chapter is not one 'plain unvarnished tale.' They declare there is another contradiction in the fact that in one verse Reuben is represented as interceding on behalf of Joseph, while in another it is Judah who saves his life by proposing to sell him. The difficulty is only imaginary; Reuben dissuades his brethren from killing Joseph by proposing to cast him into a pit, intending afterwards to rescue and restore him to his father. When the caravan approaches Judah proposes to sell him, and thus, while avoiding the guilt of murder, make a profit out of the transaction. Reuben evidently has been absent for a little, while this transaction takes place, for, in verse 29, he is said to return to the pit, and is in great trouble at not finding Joseph. It is not said whether he was told of his fate, but the whole story is so realistic and vivid in its details, that one marvels greatly how anyone could find in it two different, and, least of all, contradictory accounts.

It is contended that the opening chapters of Judges are in direct antagonism to the Book of Joshua. 'At the end

of *Joshua*, the conquest of the land is regarded as virtually accomplished; at the beginning of *Judges*, the main part is yet to do.' A careful reading of the Book of Joshua will show that while to a very large extent the country was in the possession of the Israelites, there was still a considerable portion in the hands of the old inhabitants; and a close study of *Judges* shows that not the 'main part,' but only the part indicated in *Joshua* 'was yet to do.' In Josh. xiii. there is specific mention made of certain tracts of unsubdued country, and although the following chapters give an account of the partitioning of the whole country among the tribes, the allotment was made with a view to subsequent possession, and it does not follow that at that time they entered upon the actual possession of the whole. In the eighteenth chapter there are seven tribes yet without inheritance, and with a view to allotting them their portions, Joshua sends men through the remaining part to 'map' out the districts, and according to their survey the partition was made. That this could be done shows that the Canaanites were so far quelled that they dared not make any opposition. 'The land was subdued.' 'So the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which He swore to give unto their fathers, and they possessed it and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about.' The fear of them so fell upon their enemies that they were left in peace. But that many enemies survived is clearly indicated; for instance, Josh. xvii. 14-18; xxiii. In the latter chapter Joshua says, verse 4, 'Behold I have allotted unto you *these nations that remain* to be an inheritance for your tribes from Jordan, *with all the nations that I have cut off*.' Then he promises that the Lord shall drive them out before them, and they



should possess their land, if they observe the law of Moses; otherwise he says, 'The Lord your God will no more drive these nations from out of your sight; but they shall be a snare and a trap unto you, and a scourge unto your sides.' It is worth remembering, too, that the Israelites were not sufficiently numerous actually to inhabit the whole land, and so God had promised in Deut. vii. 22, that He would cast those nations out 'little by little'; 'thou mayest not consume them at once *lest the beast of the field increase upon thee.*' In perfect harmony, then, with the whole account in *Joshua* does the history in *Judges* continue. Possibly upon the death of Joshua the subdued Canaanites began to bestir themselves again, hence the more need for prompt action on the part of the Israelites; but in any case, there was the need to proceed to take actual possession of their allotted territory. In Jud. ii. 3, the Angel of the Lord reminds the people of the very warning he had given through Joshua, that they would find the people as thorns, and their gods as snares, if they did not obey the Lord. In this connection one point of detail may be mentioned, which is considered to involve a contradiction. In Josh. x. 33, it is said, 'Then Horem, King of Gezer, came up to help Lachish, and Joshua smote him and his people until he had left him none remaining'; whereas in Jud. i. 29, we read, 'And Ephraim drove not out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer, but the Canaanites dwelt in Gezer among them.' But there is really no contradiction; all that is meant in Joshua is that the king and the army that he brought with him to the help of Lachish were slain, but that the author of *Joshua* did not understand that every inhabitant of the place perished is plain from xvi. 10, which gives practically the same

statements as *Judges*, 'And they drave not out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer; but the Canaanites dwelt in the midst of Ephraim unto this day, and became servants to do taskwork.'

I remember an infidel soldier mentioning as a glaring contradiction, and an insurmountable objection to his believing in the God of the Bible, the fact that while God gave the command, 'Thou shalt not kill,' He caused the Israelites to violate the command by slaying the Canaanites. The difficulty then seemed to me to be born of pure ignorance, but we find that the same objection is raised nowadays by Doctors of Divinity. It is said that an irreconcilable difficulty is found in the fact that while in Deut. xxiv. 16, there is the express statute providing that the father shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children for the father, but every man is to be put to death for his own sin, yet by Divine command the household of Achan shares in the punishment of its head; 'and the women and children and nurslings of the cities opposing Israel are annihilated.' We have already dealt with the whole question of the morality of the Old Testament, but a few words about this example may be allowed. We think anyone might see that the statute in Deuteronomy was to govern the national life, to be the rule of legislative procedure; but that in the case of Achan's family and the offspring of the Canaanites, an express command was given for the special occasion. And who can say that the family of Achan were not consenting parties to his ill deed, or accessories after the fact? As to the Canaanites, how could the children have been spared? The women certainly merited destruction as much as the men, and all but the children of the most tender age must have been tainted

with the general vice; and had the nurslings been spared, even if they escaped the hereditary taint, how could they have been cared for unless every city had been turned into an orphanage? But surely the objector has read his 'Butler' to little purpose if he does not realize that while for man's guidance the rule stands that each man must suffer for his own crime, yet in the providential dealings of God it constantly happens that children are overthrown in the ruin of their parents. The pestilence does not spare the children, the earthquake does not spare the children, the shipwreck does not spare the children; while even in the moral region the principle of the involving of children in their father's sin is not unknown, as in the physical region the law of heredity has sway; and in the Pentateuch itself God declares that He 'will visit the iniquities of the fathers upon the children.' God always acts wisely, and He needs not these statutes to be laid down for His guidance; but it is otherwise with puny man, whose conduct must be restricted and defined, and for the administration of law in Israel, as in England, it was a wise and necessary provision not to punish the children for the sin of their parents.

There is an apparent discrepancy in 2 Kings xv. 30, 33, and xvii. 1. Hoshea slew Pekah, and 'reigned in his stead in the *twentieth* year of Jotham the son of Uzziah,' verse 30; but in verse 33 we read that Jotham only reigned '*sixteen* years,' while in xvii. 1, it is stated that Hoshea began to reign 'in the *twelfth* year of Ahaz.' How are these two divergencies to be reconciled? With regard to the first we might say that the historian means that the conspiracy of Hoshea against Pekah occurred in the twentieth year from the *beginning* of Jotham's reign, although Jotham died in

the sixteenth, thus bringing the date down to the fourth of Ahaz. But a simpler explanation may be found in the fact that Uzziah, the father of Jotham, was for some time before his death incapacitated through his leprosy from attending to his kingly duties, and Jotham acted as regent according to 2 Kings xv. 5, and 2 Chron. xxvi. 21, 'Jotham, the king's son, was over the house judging the people of the land,' so that if we reckon four years of this regency we can understand the event as happening in the *twentieth* year of Jotham's reign, although the time of his reigning as sole king was only sixteen years. As to the second part of the difficulty, it is evident that affairs in the northern kingdom were in a very disturbed state, and following upon the captivity recorded in chapter xv. 29, was a period of interregnum: when the historian has occasion to mention Hoshea as the assassin of Pekah, he completes the information by saying 'he reigned in his stead,' although, as he shows in the seventeenth chapter, the actual reign did not commence until the twelfth year of Ahaz. Not only must the country have been thoroughly disorganized through the captivity, but it is quite possible that Hoshea himself was in captivity during the intervening years. The difficulty, at any rate, is not inexplicable.

In the following chapters there is sometimes a difficulty found with regard to the respective ages of Ahaz and Hezekiah. Ahaz was twenty years old when he began to reign, and he reigned sixteen years (2 Kings xvi. 2). Hezekiah was twenty-five years old when he succeeded his father Ahaz. Twenty-five from thirty-six would leave *eleven* as the age of Ahaz at the birth of his son, which some have deemed incredible. But we are assured that maturity is soon attained in the East, that paternity at such

an age is not unprecedented. This solution has been offered, which is worthy of notice: 'As the ancient writers, in the computation of time, take notice of the year they mention, whether finished or newly begun, so Ahaz might be near twenty-one years old at the beginning of his reign, and near seventeen years older at his death; while, on the other hand, Hezekiah, when he began to reign, might be just entering into his twenty-fifth year, and so Ahaz would be near fourteen years old when his son Hezekiah was born—no uncommon age for a young man to become a father in southern latitudes.' Certainly the difficulty in the foregoing cases is not removed by adopting the Higher Critics' position, that there are two or more narratives pieced together, for if a Redactor could so compile the different parts without any sense of incongruity between them, surely they might with equal appropriateness have come from one pen.

A difficulty is usually founded upon the variation in the two accounts of David's purchase from Araunah of a place whereon to build an altar. It is generally put thus: 2 Samuel xxiv. says that David bought the threshing-floor and the oxen for fifty shekels of silver (about £6), but 1 Chron. xxi. says that he gave for the place six hundred shekels of gold (about £1,000). The variation has often been explained, and although Dr. Horton has in his book made much of it, even going so far as to say that it almost looks as if the later authority had thought David's acknowledgment insufficient, and had wished 'to rescue the great king from an imputation of meanness,' we still think the old explanation is sufficient, viz., that the amount mentioned in Samuel was paid for the threshing-floor and the oxen; the larger amount mentioned in Chronicles was evidently for the whole 'place,' the Mount Moriah, on which the temple

was afterwards built, as indicated in 2 Chron. iii. 1. No ordinary threshing-floor would be sufficient for the temple foundations, although enough for the altar which David at first reared.

In these same chapters there is another rather perplexing variation. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 9 the census returns are given as 800,000 valiant men that drew the sword in Israel, and of Judah 500,000 men. Whereas in 1 Chron. xxi. it is stated that the numbers were—Israel 1,100,000, and Judah 470,000. The following explanation among others has been given: 'The amount here stated compared with 1 Chronicles gives a difference of 300,000; the discrepancy is only apparent, and admits of an easy reconciliation. Thus (see 1 Chron. xxvii.) there were twelve divisions of generals who commanded monthly, and whose duty was to keep guard on the royal person, each having a body of troops consisting of 24,000 men, which together formed an army of 288,000, and as a separate detachment of 12,000 was attendant on the twelve princes of the twelve tribes mentioned in the same chapter, so both are equal to 300,000. These were not reckoned in this book, because they were in the actual service of the king as a regular militia; but 1 Chron. xxi. 5, joins them to the rest, saying all those of Israel were 1,100,000; whereas the author of Samuel, who reckons only the 800,000, does not say *all* those of Israel, but barely, "and Israel were," etc. It must also be observed that, exclusive of the troops before mentioned, there was an army of observation on the frontiers of the Philistines' country composed of 30,000 men, as appears by ch. vi. 1, which it seems were included in the number of 500,000 of the people of Judah by the author of Samuel; but the



author of Chronicles, who mentions only 470,000, gives the number of that tribe exclusive of those 30,000 men because they were not all of the tribe of Judah, and, therefore, does not say all those of Judah, as he had said "all those of Israel," but only "those of Judah"; thus both accounts may be reconciled.' If this is not altogether satisfactory to everyone, it at any rate shows the possibility of explaining it without supposing a contradiction or mistake on the part of the writers; and when we remember that the writer of Chronicles in all likelihood had the Book of Samuel before him, we cannot suppose that he would make a mistake in such a matter. We might suggest another possible explanation. Put the two sums together, in Samuel 800,000 for Israel, and 500,000 for Judah, and you get the total strength of Israel as 1,300,000. In Chronicles the number of Israel may be meant to include the whole, 1,100,000, for all the nation was called Israel, and the command of David was to number Israel; and when it is said, Judah was 470,000, that may mean 470,000 of the 1,100,000, leaving a balance between the accounts of 200,000, and as if to account for that, the writer of Chronicles adds that Levi and Benjamin were not counted among them. In any case, the suggestion of Dr. Horton, that the writer of Chronicles deliberately exaggerated the numbers in order to heighten the glory of the people, is abhorrent to every right idea of trustworthy history, to say nothing of Inspiration. Indeed, Dr. Horton, following the lead of other Critics, sometimes does scant justice to the facts of the Scripture narrative, in his anxiety to prove that the author of Chronicles constantly improves upon the older history contained in *Samuel* and *Kings*, and seeks to encircle his

heroes with a halo of glory. For instance, speaking of the enormous amount of gold which David says he had prepared for the purpose of building the temple, he says, 'The older book does not mention this. But by the time of the Chronicler, tradition had swelled this provision to enormous proportions, and David is made to say, "I have prepared 100,000 talents of gold, and 1,000,000 talents of silver" (1 Chron. xxii. 14). The dream has certainly grown in the shadows of gathering time. In 1 Kings x. 14 we find it mentioned, with some admiration, that Solomon's revenue was 666 talents of gold. So that, according to the Chronicler, David had accumulated in gold alone as much as 150 years' revenue of his far wealthier son.' I do not stop to discuss the point as to the 'enormous' amount provided by David, but in passing, I may say that orthodox commentators, in view of its largeness, have suggested that the historian here reckons 'by the Babylonian, which was only a half, or the Syrian, which was only a fifth part of the Hebrew, talent,' which would considerably reduce the sum. My point at present is that it is a misrepresentation of the facts to say that 'Solomon's revenue was 666 talents of gold' only. In the passage mentioned, it is stated that 'the weight of gold that came to Solomon in one year was six hundred three score and six talents of gold.' But that was not all his revenue, for in the next verse it is added, 'Besides that, he had of the merchantmen, and of the traffic of the spice merchants, and of all the kings of Arabia, and of the governors of the country.' The contributions received from these sources must have been very great indeed. Even these were not all, for in the twenty-second verse we read of the navy that 'once in three years came bringing gold and silver, ivory

and apes, and peacocks'; in the previous chapter, verse 28, the amount of gold brought at one time by the navy is said to have been '420 talents.' So abundant was the gold thus brought that 'all king Solomon's drinking vessels were of gold,' etc.; and silver 'was nothing accounted of in the days of Solomon,' for 'the king made silver to be as stone.' Besides all this, we are told, still in what is called the 'older and simpler narrative,' 'that all the earth sought the presence of Solomon to hear his wisdom which God had put in his heart. And they brought, every man his present, vessels of silver, and vessels of gold, and raiment, and armour, and spices, horses and mules, a rate year by year'; and that these presents would form a very considerable addition to the sum total of Solomon's income may be seen from the fact that one visitor alone, the Queen of Sheba, gave him '120 talents of gold, and of spices very great store, and precious stones.' Well might the author of *Kings* say, 'So Solomon exceeded all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom.' Now, surely anyone who could say that the whole revenue of the king was 666 talents of gold has not carefully read the narrative. Then, too, the theory of the uniform exaggeration of the Chronicler breaks down at this point, for when we turn to his account for the estimate of Solomon's wealth, we find that he describes it in exactly the same terms as the author of *Kings*.

Again Dr. Horton says, 'When, for example, in the account of Solomon's relations with Hiram (1 Kings ix. 12), the older historian says that Solomon gave to Hiram twenty cities in the land of Galilee, and the Chronicler (2 Chron. viii. 2) speaks of "the cities which Hiram had given to Solomon," we are to conclude that the later author,

dazzled with the glory of the great king, could not credit the story that Solomon had handed over cities in his own land to a stranger, and assumed that the transaction had been precisely the other way.' Now, why should we come to such a conclusion? We have just seen that the author of *Kings* gives as dazzling a view of the glory of Solomon as the Chronicler; why should *he* not think the transaction inconsistent with that glory? Is it not more reasonable to suppose that Hiram gave Solomon certain cities in exchange for the twenty given to him? Or more likely still, that Hiram being dissatisfied with the cities, as in 1 Kings ix. 12, 13, we are distinctly told he was, gave them back to Solomon, the wise king meanwhile giving him something else as an equivalent?

We give one more instance of Dr. Horton's hasty conclusions. He says, 'In 1 Kings v. 13 Solomon sends a levy of 30,000 men out of Israel to do the work, while the Chronicler (2 Chron. ii. 17) insists on it that these hewers of wood, etc., were *strangers*, and he gives their number exactly the same as the passage in Kings, which suggests that he purposely corrects the impression that native-born Israelites would be employed on such *corvée*-work.' Evidently he means that the 30,000 men were 'these hewers of wood,' etc., whom the Chronicler 'insists' upon calling 'strangers'; but when we turn to the book we find it is not so. The passage in Kings, besides mentioning the 30,000 men of Israel, of whom only 10,000 were sent at a time to Lebanon, says that Solomon 'had threescore and ten thousand that bare burdens; and fourscore thousand that were hewers in the mountains'; and in exact accordance with this, the numbers of these burden-

bearers is given in Chronicles as 70,000, and of the hewers 80,000. When first mentioned in 2 Chron. ii. 2 it is not said whether they were strangers or not; it is only when we reach the close of the chapter that this information is given. And so in 1 Kings v. 13, while the 30,000, not mentioned by the Chronicler, are described as of Israel, nothing is said of the nationality of those who did the menial work; but in chapter ix. 20 we are told that of the remnant of the Amorites, etc., 'did Solomon raise a levy of bond-servants'; and it is added that 'of the children of Israel did Solomon make no bond-servants.' Thus there is perfect harmony between the two accounts. The 10,000 men sent monthly to Lebanon were evidently engaged in the more responsible work of overseeing, etc. In both Kings and Chronicles there is mention made of a number who 'bare rule over the people that wrought in the work'; and in this detail a discrepancy has also been found. In 1 Kings v. 16 the number is given as '3,300,' while in 2 Chron. ii. 2 and 18 it is 3,600. This need cause no difficulty, as the numbers might vary during the time of service, and an evidence of the underlying accuracy of both accounts is found in another passage, which at first sight looks like another discrepancy. In 1 Kings ix. 23 the number of 'the *chief* officers which bare rule over the people that wrought in the work' is given as 550, while in 2 Chron. viii. 10 the number is '250.' As in the latter passage, they are simply said to bear 'rule over the people,' it is suggested that the two authors are reckoning from a slightly different standpoint, but the chief matter to notice is that their *totals* agree. Thus in Kings we have  $3,300 + 550 = 3,850$ , and in Chron.  $3,600 + 250 = 3,850$ .

These are a fair specimen of the discrepancies, and I cannot stay to give more at present. But in view of the way in which the Higher Critics speak of these historical portions of the Old Testament, and especially of the Chronicles, we are forced to ask, Can they assign to the writings any real inspiration at all? We are constantly told that the Higher Criticism does not lessen our reverence for the Bible, but helps us to understand it. Dr. Driver says it does 'not touch either the authority or inspiration of the Old Testament.' It is high time for such men to tell us exactly what they mean by Inspiration. Dr. Cheyne, in his most recent work, makes the following naïve confession. He is criticising Dr. Driver's position of compromise as insufficient, and he thus proceeds: 'Of course the Chronicles are *Inspired*, not as the prophecies of Jeremiah, but as *even a sermon* might be called inspired, *i.e.*, touched in a high degree with the best spiritual influences of *the time*. Dr. Driver says (in his preface), "It was the function of inspiration to guide the individual writer (historian) in the choice and disposition of his material, and in his use of it for the inculcation of special lessons." But clearly this can be true of the Chronicles only with those limitations subject to which *the same thing could be said of any conscientious and humble-minded preacher* of the Christian Church. And if these limitations cannot be borne in mind, *it is better to drop the word altogether*, and express what we mean by some other term. That there are some passages in Chronicles which have a *specially inspiring quality*, and may *therefore* be called *inspired*, is not, of course, to be denied.' (The italics, except the first word 'inspired,' are mine.) I make no comment upon this singular statement, but say, in the language of Thomas Carlyle, 'It is significant of much.'



## LECTURE XIV.

### MORE ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES AND CONTRADICTIONS.

THE *discrepancies* we have been considering are such as have always been alleged by sceptical opponents. The Higher Critics not only echo all the old objections, but they have by their method found out several new ones, and their usual plan is to magnify all seeming divergencies, and so strengthen their case for a patchwork authorship. It is beyond our plan to enter fully into these matters, but we may just glance at a few of the difficulties they have raised, before passing on to note some of the alleged discrepancies in the New Testament.

We have incidentally, in former lectures, touched upon many of their contentions, and shall not now recur to these.

It is one of their leading points, that the Levitical system of priesthood as depicted in Leviticus and Numbers is different from that set forth in Deuteronomy. In the former 'a sharp distinction is drawn between the priests and common Levites; in Deuteronomy it is implied that *all* members of the tribe of Levi are qualified to exercise priestly functions.' It is alleged that in harmony with this distinction the earlier historical books support the view of Deuteronomy, while the later ones maintain the distinction between Priests and Levites. Now we might say that since, according to the theory, Ezra first promulgated the

Levitical code, the fact that in Ezra and Nehemiah, the distinction between Priests and Levites is noted *before* Ezra makes known the Law, proves that the separation was not then for the first time made. We should be told, however, that the writers of these books represent as then existing the state of things with which they were afterwards themselves familiar.

Without entering into details, I mention one matter that ought to overthrow the whole theory. It is assumed that the older historians knew of no distinction between Priests and Levites, but that the later ones did; that the Chronicler, for instance, who always reads into his history the usages of his own times, maintains the distinction. Now, what do we find? While it is true that generally the Chronicler does speak of 'Priests *and* Levites,' yet, in 2 Chron. xxx. 27, he says, 'Then the priests *the* Levites arose and blessed the people' (Rev. Ver.); and, in 2 Chron. v. 5, we read, 'These did the priests *the* Levites bring up.' This latter passage is the more striking when we compare it with the account of the same transaction in 1 Kings viii. 4, 'Even these did the priests *and* the Levites bring up.' According to the theory, the writer of Kings would be expected to say, 'the priests *the* Levites,' and the author of Chronicles to say, 'the priests *and* the Levites'; when we find the exact reverse of this, does it not look as if the hypothesis of the Higher Criticism is at fault?

Another discrepancy has been found in connection with the Tabernacle. According to Exodus xxxvi., the work of building the Tabernacle is commenced after Moses has come down from the mount with the second 'tables of stone'; but in Exodus xxxiii., after the first tables are

broken, on the discovery of the affair of the golden calf, and *before* he ascends the mount the second time, we read of Moses pitching the Tabernacle. The critical way of putting it is that chapters xxv. to xxxi. 18, 'form P's account of the instructions given to Moses respecting the Tabernacle and the priesthood'; while xxxv. to xl. form the sequel, narrating the execution of the instructions. The intervening portion containing 'the narrative of the Golden Calf as a whole may be assigned plausibly to E,' though parts of it 'appear to have been expanded by the compiler of J E.' The conclusion drawn is that J had a different idea as to the time of the pitching of the Tabernacle, while P knew nothing of the incident of the golden calf.

Now the word 'Tabernacle,' given in the Authorised Version, is somewhat misleading; the Revised Version rightly gives it as 'Tent'; and it is at once evident that the Tent thus mentioned is not the Tabernacle afterwards reared, but a particular tent, in all probability the tent of Moses, whereon, before the building of the Tabernacle, the glory of the Lord rested. Evidently, because of the displeasure of the Lord on account of His people's sin, Moses now takes his tent outside the camp, as an indication of that displeasure, and he calls it the 'Tent of Meeting,' signifying that there God would meet with those who sought His face. This is borne out by the Septuagint, which renders '*his* tent'; but, apart from that, any careful reader might see that the tent of Moses was meant, and that before the building of the Tabernacle it would be needful that in some particular spot in the camp Jehovah should manifest Himself, and what more likely place than the tent of the great leader of the people?

It is, however, objected that the tense of the Hebrew verb means that Moses 'used to take,' and so indicates his practice; even so it would only refer to his practice before the Tabernacle proper was available. But although the Revised Version supports the translation 'used to take,' the whole context seems to favour the old rendering 'took.' The use of the tenses in the Hebrew does not settle the point, as it is held by Hebrew scholars (by Canon Driver himself), that the Hebrew 'imperfect' (future) while it sometimes has the force of expressing what is customary, is also used for the 'past' (preterite) in vivid narration. Read the whole section, and you will see that this idea of vividness exactly meets the case. The people have sinned; God is displeased; Moses is indignant at the sinful conduct, and he takes his tent and withdraws to the outskirts of the camp. The whole scene lives before your eyes, and here, if anywhere, the vivid past might be indicated by the imperfect tense. So the Septuagint gives 'having taken' (*λαβὼν τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ*). Otherwise you would have to translate uniformly, 'he *used* to call it the tent of meeting,' 'the people used to go out,' 'the cloud used to descend.' The Critics would accept the two latter renderings, but what of this other: 'Joshua . . . used not to depart out of the tent'? Can it be said to mean that Joshua never left the tent? Moses' calling it 'the tent of meeting' is mentioned as a significant fact, implying that *then*, on account of the sin of the people, they could not elsewhere meet with God. So far from this section being distinct from and opposed to the other portion, this very phrase is applied to the Tabernacle in the next section, 'Tent of meeting.' But if 'Tent' in the thirty-third chapter were really the Tabernacle of the

fortieth chapter, then whatever the Critics may say of the respective knowledge of P and J, we have the Redactor so bunglingly piecing the narratives as to give the ridiculous result that the Tabernacle was pitched and used as a meeting-place before the materials of it were provided, before it was constructed, before it was erected. There should be another name than discrepancy for this.

The narrative of the spies has long been held to reveal a discrepancy, Numbers saying that God commanded Moses to send the spies, while in Deuteronomy Moses attributes the proposal to the people. The answer has always been easy. The people desired and God acceded to the people's wish, and instructed Moses to send them, the perfect harmony between Moses, the representative of God, and the people, being indicated in Deuteronomy by the statement, 'The saying pleased me well.' It remained for the Higher Critics, while emphasizing the old objection, to point out further discrepancies. Not content with assigning the accounts in Numbers and Deuteronomy to different authors, they maintain that the account in Numbers is the work of several hands. They say that one account represents the spies as sent from 'the wilderness of Paran,' the other from Kadesh; according to one they only go as far as Hebron, according to the other they explore the whole country to Rehob; one represents them as saying the land was exceedingly fertile, the other that it was an impoverished land; in the one account Caleb alone stills the people, and he alone receives the promise of entering into the land, in the other Joshua joins with Caleb in seeking to pacify them and shares in the promise. Now, an ordinary reader would certainly wonder how all these divergencies are made out.

It is very simple. Take Num. xiii. and xiv., and divide thus: xiii. 1-17<sup>a</sup>, 21, 25-26<sup>a</sup> (to Paran), 32<sup>a</sup>; xiv. 1, 2 (in the main), 5-7, 10, 26-38 (in the main), that is P's narrative; xiii. 17<sup>b</sup>-20, 22-24, 26<sup>b</sup>-31, 32<sup>b</sup>, 33; xiv. 3-4, 8-9, 11-25, 39-45, that is the narrative of J E, which means that J wrote one part and E another, but the work of each is not distinguishable, and so it is treated as a composite whole. It seems hardly worth while to argue against this style of thing. If we were allowed to treat any other narrative in this fashion, the most homogeneous story ever written might be broken up into sections, which could be set in opposition to each other. Surely it is plain from verses 21, 22, that the spies first went northward, then, coming back by the western border, went south as far as Hebron, and so 'passed through' the land. There is no reason whatever for any division here except the exigencies of the Critics' theory. The passage relied upon to show that the starting-points were different is mainly the twenty-sixth verse—they return to the place whence they started, in the one case to 'the wilderness of Paran,' the other 'to Kadesh,' but the verse says they came 'unto the wilderness of Paran, to Kadesh'; and it seems almost ludicrous to make a break in the middle of a clause like this: surely the plain meaning is that Kadesh was in the wilderness of Paran; evidently the Redactor thought so, at any rate. The conflicting terms of the report are easily explained; the general account is that it is a good land, a fertile land, but there is the drawback that the enemies are powerful. When Caleb seeks to encourage the dispirited people; the faint-hearted spies seek to paint the picture as black as possible, and so they say that 'it is a land that eateth up the inhabitants';



this is the expression which Canon Driver takes to mean an impoverished land, but surely it may more naturally mean that it was *unhealthy*, and that might be said quite consistently with the report of its fruitfulness. As to the remaining supposititious difficulty, it is not surprising that Caleb should have more prominence given to him than Joshua. He represented a more influential tribe—Judah. He was more emphatically one of the people, since Joshua occupied an official position as Moses' minister, and so might be expected to agree with his leader.

It is contended that Josh. xiv. supports the account that represents Caleb as the only faithful spy. Says Horton, echoing Driver, but exceeding him in emphasis, 'A glance at Josh. xiv. 7, where Caleb is addressing Joshua, shows that according to the narrative Caleb was certainly not thinking of Joshua as a fellow spy.' One advice I would give is, when a Higher Critic gives the meaning of a passage, always look it up for yourselves. Turning to Josh. xiv. we read the sixth verse, and find that Caleb says to Joshua, 'Thou knowest the thing that the Lord spake unto Moses the man of God, concerning me and *concerning thee* in Kadesh Barnea.' Why did Dr. Horton suppress this important clause which so plainly proves the opposite of what he asserts? Driver does notice the clause, and explains it, how? In the true Higher Critical fashion; the particular clause, which represents Joshua as being with Caleb, 'it seems must have been added for the purpose of accommodating the narrative to that of P in Num. xiii., xiv.!' Of course, in that way you can prove anything. If you find anything that does not square with your theory, treat it as an addition, an interpolation; remove it, and then

you will find your theory is vindicated. That is not an unusual course of procedure with the Critics; it may be ingenious, it may evidence great intellectual ability; it will hardly commend itself to Christian feeling or common-sense.

These may be taken as specimens of the difficulties discovered—we may almost say invented—by the Critics. More I have not time to give, but I must notice one of a slightly different character which has recently been made prominent. In the account of the bringing up of the ark (1 Chron. xvi.), the historian represents David as the author of the Psalm there given; but it is contended that the Psalm itself distinctly refers to the dispersion of the people amongst the heathen, and is actually composed of citations from Psalms xcvi., cv., cvi., and cvii. The insinuation is that the Chronicler made selections from these Psalms, which are held to be of a late date, and stringing them together put them in the mouth of David on this occasion. Why not rather suppose that these Psalms, which are given in the Psalter without an author's name, were written by David, and that on the occasion mentioned in Chronicles he either took these various portions and combined them as specially suitable for the purpose in view; or that the Psalm as given in Chronicles was the original composition, and that he afterwards expanded its various portions into the form of these other Psalms? There are a few significant variations between the two versions, which show that the one is not an exact copy of the other, although if it were that would be no argument against the Inspiration of both. Or, if the Davidic authorship of the other Psalms referred to be rejected, why not suppose that they are the production of some inspired songster, who, familiar with the dedication song of David as given in Chronicles, thus echoes and expands it?

As to the other part of the objection—that the Psalm refers to the dispersion of the Hebrew people among the heathen—it is not so very formidable. If it be admitted that David spoke the truth when he said, ‘The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His word was upon my tongue,’ where is the difficulty in supposing that, thus inspired, David, in composing a song suitable for worship, not only in his own time, but in the days to come, should use words which would anticipate the future condition of the people, and prophetically forecast the dispersion?

But it is worth noting that, after all, the passage in Chronicles does not actually refer to a dispersion among the heathen. ‘Gather us from among the heathen’ are the words of Psalm cvi., but in Chronicles we have ‘gather us together.’ It is the same word as that used in Psalm cvi., but the condition in which the people are is not specified. The word is constantly used when there is no thought of a dispersion. Thus Jacob addresses his sons, ‘Gather yourselves together and hear;’ so we often read of Israel gathering themselves together, gathering together to David, of the kings gathering the people together, etc. In all such cases it is mainly the rallying-point that is suggested; if the condition of the people gathered is made prominent, it is made so by some additional phrase—‘out of the cities,’ ‘from the uttermost parts,’ ‘from among the nations’—as in Psalm cvi. But in Chronicles, David simply speaks of being gathered unto the Lord; to His presence; for His worship; for the enjoyment of His salvation. Then he adds, ‘Deliver us from the nations,’ which may give a little colour to the objection; but again we remark that to deliver ‘*from* the nations’ does not

necessarily mean that the people to be delivered are actually scattered among the nations, and held in their power. The people were surrounded on all hands by hostile nations, and David might well teach them to pray that they might be delivered from these nations, in the sense of being preserved from them, just as we pray 'deliver us from evil.' The particular word which occurs in the Psalm is most frequently, we admit, used of deliverance out of actual enthrallment. But it is not so always; thus when the Psalmist speaks of being 'delivered from death,' 'from hell,' he can only mean preserved from death, preserved from going down to hell. But again we say that even if David did mean gathering out of, and delivering from, the actual grasp of the nations, there need be no difficulty on the supposition that by the spirit of prophecy he could have in view the future condition of the people. On the supposition that the Chronicler took the citations from the Psalms and put them in the mouth of David, we have an example of the incongruity and stupidity which the Higher Critics are constantly imputing to the writers of the Bible. The assumption, with which we are now familiar, is that the writer of Chronicles lived during or after the dispersion, and that in depicting the former times he generally colours them with the hues of his own times; and so it comes that here the shadow of the dispersion with which he was acquainted appears. But the Chronicler has just celebrated David's victory over the Philistines, and has declared that 'the fame of David went out into all lands, and the Lord brought the fear of him upon all nations.' Could the same writer be so stupid, then, as immediately to represent the people as dispersed among the heathen, and David as

teaching them to pray to be gathered out from the nations and delivered?

It has been felt by some that there is a difficulty in reconciling 2 Kings xviii. 5 with xxiii. 25, the expression 'after him was none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor among them that were before him,' being applied to both Hezekiah and Josiah. The Higher Critics, of course, explain it by their usual hypothesis of a double narrative. It might be possible to take the phrase merely as a proverbial expression indicating the highest excellence; but I think, on closer examination, it will be seen that the characteristics of Hezekiah and Josiah were somewhat different, so that each may be said to have excelled his predecessors and successors in a particular direction. Especially note that it is Hezekiah's *trust* in God that is mentioned as the reason for the commendation; while in Josiah's case the reason is thus given, 'He *turned* to the Lord with all his heart.' Hezekiah, from the beginning of his reign, was animated by profound trust in God and zeal for His worship. Josiah, though pious from his youth, was ignorant of the full requirements of the law until the book of the law was found in the temple, and then he turned to the Lord with all his heart.

There is little space left to deal with the alleged discrepancies of the New Testament. I should have liked to have dealt with the varying accounts of the genealogies, the crucifixion, the resurrection, the death of Judas, the inscription on the cross, etc. It would be quite possible to suggest explanations which would go far towards the complete reconciliation of every seeming inconsistency. Such explanations, however, you will find in any good commentary, and I must content myself with noticing a few instances which have lately obtained special prominence.

There is first the case of the healing of the blind man at Jericho. Matthew speaks of two men being cured as Jesus departed from Jericho; Mark speaks of one, and gives his name as Bartimæus. Luke mentions one blind man, but seems to differ from both the others by placing the cure at the entrance to Jericho instead of the exit from it. Of course, there is no actual discrepancy between Matthew and Mark, inasmuch as the latter does not say there was *only* one; he mentions one by name as being likely better known. The real difficulty is as to the place of cure. There are several ways of reconciling the divergence. One blind man may have been sitting at the entrance to Jericho as Jesus passed; he asks what the noise means, and then follows on. When Jesus comes out of the house of Zaccheus, he joins the procession, and follows till he gets the cure outside the city, where he joins the other blind man; but Luke having noticed him at that point of his narrative, gives, then, the whole particulars of the cure before going on to speak of the visit to Zaccheus, so as not to interrupt the flow of his narrative.

Another explanation is that the one was cured at the entrance to Jericho, and the other at the departure, Luke giving the one and Mark the other, and Matthew combining the two accounts in a condensed form; or that while one might be cured before entering, there might still be the other two cured afterwards. We must remember that blindness was very prevalent in those days (as it still is in the East), and there are many statements in the Gospels which show that frequent cures of the blind took place. I might mention, as another explanation, that which takes the verb translated 'drew near' in Luke to mean simply 'was near'; and that therefore it may mean in departing rather than in entering



and that Luke here, as elsewhere, does not follow the chronological order. I have also met somewhere the suggestion that there were two Jerichos, Old and New Town, and that the cure took place between the two, and so might be described as at the entrance or at the exit of Jericho. Again I observe that while any of these explanations may meet the case, it is quite possible that we have not hit upon the correct one; but these attempts at a solution show that a solution is not impossible, and we are not warranted in deciding off hand that one of the Evangelists made a mistake.

Matthew's account of the words of Jairus has also been cited as an instance of discrepancy. We may notice it here, though it might better come under the next section as an instance of a varying version. The exact point of the difficulty is that, according to Matthew, Jairus says, 'My daughter is even now dead;' whereas, according to Mark and Luke, he says that she 'is a dying,' and is afterwards informed that she was dead. 'About this later information Matthew says nothing.' Yes; but in not saying anything, he does not contradict the others. And we may suppose that the expression he uses, since his whole account is very condensed as compared with the others, is meant to include Jairus' first statement and the further news of his daughter's death. He gives not the exact words, but the sense of what was said, and that, as we shall seek to show in our next, is quite in accordance with Verbal Inspiration.

But while that is one way of explaining the difficulty, I confess I rather incline to the view that Matthew's report of what Jairus said is to be taken literally, and that he did say at first, 'My daughter has just died,' or, taking the old version as giving the real purport of the expression, 'My

daughter is even now dead,' grief and fear leading him to exaggerate; 'she is at the point of death, she is all but dead, she is dead unless Thou dost help'; that seems the purport of it. Mark tells us that he said, 'My little daughter is at the point of death; I pray Thee that Thou come and lay Thy hands on her that she may be made whole and live.' Luke just mentions the fact of his falling down and pleading with Jesus, but he adds one matter omitted by Mark, that 'she was about twelve years of age,' 'and lay a dying.' Now, it is evident that the grief-stricken man, out of the fulness of his heart, poured out his desires very earnestly to Christ, and I, for one, do not think it at all unlikely that he gave utterance to all the expressions recorded; broken his utterances likely were, and through his sobs we can hear him saying, 'My little daughter is dying; she is at the point of death; I fear she is even now dead.'

The alleged mistakes of Stephen claim some attention. The first is thus put: 'In Acts vii. 4, Stephen says that Abraham came to Canaan after his father was dead. But by comparing Gen. xi. 26, 32, xii. 4, we learn that Terah lived many years after Abraham left Haran.' The second is that Stephen says Abraham bought the sepulchre in Shechem of one of the sons of Hamor; Gen. xxiii. says Abraham bought the field of Machpelah of Ephron the Hittite, and Gen. xxxiii., that Jacob bought a field at Shechem of the sons of Hamor. Stephen seems to say that Jacob and his twelve sons were buried in Shechem; Genesis shows that Jacob was buried in Machpelah, and says nothing about the place of his sons' burial. It is very easy to charge Stephen with making mistakes, but is it fair; is it necessary? Is there no other way out of the difficulty?

Is it likely that a man so well acquainted, as Stephen shows himself to be, with all the Hebrew history, would make such manifest blunders, even if he had not the special guidance of the Spirit? Is it likely that such a mistake would be allowed to pass by an audience so critical and hostile? They were not able to resist the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake, and part of that inability arose from the fact that he was so well versed in all Jewish matters, that they could not detect a solitary flaw in his reasoning nor a mistake in his historical summary. But, in addition to all this, Stephen was full of the Holy Ghost. All admit that he had Inspiration of the fullest kind as promised by Christ. But Christ's promise included guidance both as to matter and words. Even if it could be supposed that Stephen made a mistake, is it likely that Luke, writing after a considerable interval, should, after calm reflection, in his usual accurate manner, deliberately record these mistakes, if mistakes they be?

Various explanations have been suggested of the seeming difficulties. The passages in Genesis, of course, on the face of them, yield this result: Terah was seventy years old and begat Abraham, Nahor, and Haran. Abraham was seventy-five when he left Haran for Canaan.  $75 + 70 = 145$  as the age of Terah as that time. The death of Terah took place, according to Stephen, before Abraham left Haran, and it is recorded in that order in Genesis; but he was two hundred and five years old when he died; here, then, there is a difference of sixty years to account for. Is there no way of doing so without crediting Stephen with blundering? Some would explain the death of Terah as meaning, according to a Jewish idea, his spiritual death, when he rejected all his son's entreaties and elected to remain a confirmed idolater. Bengel explains

Stephen's statement as meaning that Abraham did not receive a *domicile* in the land of Canaan till after Terah's death; that though his wanderings commenced before his father's death, yet the home of his father, as the head of the tribe, would, in accordance with Patriarchal and Nomadic usage, be regarded as the domicile of all the members of the tribe; but after his death Abraham received another domicile, and Canaan became the head-quarters of the tribe. There is something in that, but I think a simpler explanation is at hand. It is this. The fact of Abraham's name being placed first on the list of his father's sons does not imply that he was the firstborn. Yet that is the only ground for the inference that he was the eldest. According to Scripture usage, the most important member of the family is often placed first, *e.g.*, Shem heads the list of Noah's sons, but it is evident, from the tenth chapter of Genesis, that he was not the eldest. Suppose, then, as we legitimately may, that Abraham was not the eldest, but the youngest, and it is quite possible to bridge over the gulf, as it was no uncommon thing for so great an interval as sixty years to lie between the birth of the eldest and the youngest. There are not wanting hints even in Genesis that Abraham was the youngest. When he went forth to Canaan at seventy-five, he took with him his brother's son Lot, then grown to man's estate; and it is before stated that Haran died in Ur of the Chaldees, and then, after the mention of his death, it is stated that Abraham and Nahor married. Manifestly Haran was by much the eldest. In confirmation of this, we have the testimony of Josephus that Abraham and Nahor married the daughters of Haran. In Genesis it is said that Nahor married Milcah, the daughter of Haran, and that Iscah was

another daughter of Haran; and the Jews considered Iscah as another name for Sarai. The word that Abraham used in Gen. xx. 12, translated daughter, might well be taken to mean the grand-daughter of his father. Not to press that, however, there is the fact that Nahor married the daughter of Haran, so that he must have been younger than Haran; and then, from what we read afterwards of his family, the fact, *e.g.*, that his grand-daughter, Rebekah, was old enough to be married to Abraham's son, we conclude that Nahor was older than Abraham. Thus we have ample ground for believing that Terah was much more than seventy at the birth of Abraham; that, indeed, his death at two hundred and five might very well only leave Abraham seventy-five. When it is possible so to understand the narrative of Genesis, why should we jump to the conclusion that Stephen misunderstood the facts of the case?

As to the other case, there is nothing said in Genesis to contradict the statement that the sons of Jacob were buried in Shechem; there is the fact recorded in Joshua that Joseph was buried there, and, according to tradition, the tombs of the twelve patriarchs were long pointed out in Shechem. When Stephen says Jacob 'died, he and our fathers, and were carried over into Shechem and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought,' he is making a compressed statement, and the subject to the 'were carried' may well be taken to be 'our fathers'; the fully elaborated statement would be, 'he and our fathers were carried over, he to Machpelah and they to Shechem,' but there is no need for him to stop in the rush of his noble speech to say so. As the Rev. Ver. puts it, the attention is directed to the fathers, 'And he died himself and our fathers; and they were carried

over unto Shechem.' The antecedent to the 'they' is strictly the 'fathers.' The more important point is about the purchase by Abraham 'of the sons of Hamor.' Is there any difficulty in supposing that Abraham bought a field in Shechem as well as Machpelah; and that after the lapse of years it became needful for Jacob to repurchase it? Does not this explain Jacob's going to Shechem when he came out of Padan-aram? He wanted to secure his property.

In any case, there are ways of explaining the matter without charging the Inspired authors with error, and we stand on this, that no one can prove that Abraham did *not* purchase a plot of land in Shechem, or that the twelve patriarchs were not buried there.

Some talk about the spiritual teaching being Inspired, but not the historical statements; but the whole of Stephen's reasoning is based upon the historical; and the first of the instances we have been considering is not an independent historical statement, but *his interpretation* of the statement in Genesis. Did not the Spirit, which so fully possessed him, guide him correctly to interpret the Old Testament? Surely in this sphere we expect the clearest guidance of the Spirit; and if we are to suppose that he was left to himself in interpreting such important points of history, how can we be sure that the Spirit aided him in his reasonings upon the history which, according to our opponents, he so glaringly misinterprets?

We strongly maintain that no absolutely irreconcilable discrepancy has been advanced, and if there should be such a discrepancy found, we submit that it is more becoming on our part humbly to think that our knowledge is at fault, than to attribute to the sacred writers, whose Inspiration is so abundantly proved, imperfection and mistake.



## LECTURE XV.

VARIATIONS IN THE ACCOUNTS. — QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.—PAUL'S SO-CALLED DISCLAIMER OF INSPIRATION.

**B**RIEFLY, let us consider the objection to Verbal Inspiration, based upon the fact that admittedly *variant accounts are given of certain events and different reports of speeches.*

It seems to be contended that if the *words* are Inspired, then the same words must always be used in recounting the same circumstances. That, at least, is the converse of the proposition that because the same words are not used in each account, therefore the words are not inspired. Now, this objection rests upon a misconception of the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration. The doctrine, as we have been advocating it, leaves full play for the human faculties of the writer. Each man, under the guidance of the Spirit, draws his words from his own vocabulary. His own particular style is preserved, and made to subserve the gracious purpose of the Spirit of God. Each man is led to depict the facts from his own point of view, to represent the truth according to his own apprehension of it; while in all the dominating Spirit controls, preserves from error, leads into the truth. We therefore say that when we have in Matthew

a particular account of some event, or a report of some speech, *'that* is Verbally Inspired. Matthew records the truth, and he records it in language which the Holy Spirit has guided him to use; his very language is inspired.' We find in Mark a slightly different account of the same event, a variant echo of the same speech. Are we to say that in Mark we have not the same kind of Inspiration that we have in Matthew? As we understand Inspiration, we have no hesitation in ascribing the same absolute Inspiration to the writing of Mark. We say that he declares the same truth; and though he uses different words, he has been none the less guided by the Holy Spirit in the choice of his words, and they also are Inspired. There is no difficulty in supposing this, unless we are to believe that the Spirit of God must be tied to one particular set of expressions; that having guided Matthew to use one word to express the meaning, He may not guide Mark to express the same thought, or some other phase of the same thought, by a different word. In ordinary writing, we freely grant such a liberty. A man may write a description of some scene he has witnessed, and every word may be correct, and may fitly express his meaning, and yet he may on another occasion, in writing an account of the same scene, use to a large extent different language, and yet maintain the correctness of the narrative. If men may be allowed to express themselves in different ways, may not the same liberty be granted to the Holy Spirit? With regard to varying accounts of the same facts, it is enough to say that we apply to them the same reasoning that we apply to the seeming discrepancies; underneath all the variations there is essential unity, and the fact that the Spirit has led one

to give prominence to one point, and another to another, only enhances the resultant value of the whole narrative. Take, for instance, the case of the denial of Peter, which is sometimes classed among the discrepancies. According to all the four Evangelists, in the first instance it was a 'maid' that charged Peter with being one of Christ's disciples, John adding the additional information that it was the maid 'that kept the door,' and Mark intimating that it was one of the maids 'of the high priest's house.' The second charge was made, according to Matthew, by 'another maid,' according to Mark simply 'the maid'; but Luke says it was a '*man*.' The seeming difficulty is removed by John, who shows that several charged him at the same time: '*They* said therefore unto him.' There is a further incidental confirmation of this in the fact that both Matthew and Mark say that the maid said to them that stood by, 'This man also was with Jesus the Nazarene,' and thus a graphic picture is presented: we see the maid telling the men gathered there, and then several clamouring together, one man, according to Luke, being the prominent spokesman. Then in the third case Matthew and Mark say 'they that stood by'; Luke mentions one man again particularly, and John also mentions this one man, further identifying him as a servant of the high priest, being 'kinsman of him whose ear Peter cut off.' Just the kind of information we should expect from John, who was so well acquainted with the high priest's household. Thus all is harmonious, and the little variations are incident to the individualities of the writers, and are used by the Spirit of God to bring out more fully the actual details. Or take the healing of the Centurion's servant recorded by Matthew and Luke. Ac-

cording to Matthew, we might understand that the Centurion came with his request to Jesus; but Luke, who gives a fuller account, shows that first of all he sent a deputation of the Jewish elders to Christ to intercede on his behalf, and after an interval, when Christ was coming towards the house at the request of the elders, he sent some of his friends with the words so full of faith and humility as to win the admiration of the Lord Himself. Thus what Matthew represents the Centurion as doing is simply, according to the common method of expression, what he did by others, unless we conclude, as there is some ground for doing, that, having sent the friends, he then in his earnestness comes himself to Christ; and so Matthew literally, as well as virtually, agrees with Luke.

At first sight, it perhaps seems more difficult to understand the fact that there should be different reports of the sayings of our Lord and others; but I think if we hold fast this principle of interpretation, the difficulty will vanish. I think, possibly, we may arrange these differences into four classes:

1. *There are cases where similar words may have been spoken on different occasions, and one writer may report one utterance, and another the other.* The differences in such cases would be in the speeches themselves. There need be no hesitation in believing that Jesus often impressed the same truths upon different audiences. There was no necessity for Him to give an entirely different address on every occasion, and in giving an address similar in substance He might well vary it in details. To this class belong the two parables which some have declared to be different versions of the same—the parable of the talents, and the parable of the pounds. Although there is a striking similarity between them, yet the differences are also striking, and there need be no

reasonable doubt that they were spoken on different occasions and to different audiences, as the hints given by Matthew and Luke respectively as to place, time, and people clearly show. To the same class I should be disposed, though with some hesitation, to assign the so-called different versions of the Sermon on the Mount. The opinion of commentators is pretty equally divided on the point, such men as Calvin, Grotius, Meyer, Tischendorf, Stier, holding that there was but one discourse; Erasmus, Lange, Greswell, Birks, Webster and Wilkinson, maintaining that there were two. One thing is noteworthy—that Matthew gives some definite notes of time which would fix the discourse early in our Lord's ministry; while Luke as definitely seems to make it come after the choice of the twelve disciples, at a later period. If we consider that there were two discourses spoken on different occasions, there is no difficulty left to face; if we regard them as two versions of the same discourse, the difficulty is not insurmountable, on the understanding that the Spirit guided both writers to give the different summaries of it.

2. *There are cases where each Evangelist may give some portion of what was said.* The variant accounts of Christ's words concerning fasting might be classed under this head. By putting all the accounts together, you get a full idea of what was said. So, in the case of the woman with the issue of blood recorded by the Scriptures, Matthew simply mentions that Jesus turned Him about when the woman touched His garment; Mark says that when He turned He asked the question, 'Who touched My clothes?' Luke gives it as, 'Who touched Me?' but Mark, in reporting the disciples' answer to the Lord, puts Luke's form of the question into their lips, 'Who touched Me?' Luke adds

Christ's answer to them, which neither Matthew nor Mark gives. 'Somebody hath touched Me, for I perceive that virtue has gone out of Me.' Matthew gives the Lord's final word to the woman as 'Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole.' Luke's version is, 'Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole,' adding what Matthew omits, 'Go in peace.' Mark, omitting 'Be of good comfort,' gives, 'Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole,' adding with Luke, 'go in peace,' and further giving what neither Matthew nor Luke gives, 'and be whole of thy plague.' Again, put all together, and you get a full report. So with many other cases; as in the transfiguration scene, Matthew gives the utterance of the voice from heaven, 'This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear Him,' while Mark and Luke omit the clause, 'In whom I am well pleased.'

3. *There are cases where one Evangelist may give the very words and others only give the substance.* Thus Mark and Luke give the exact words from heaven as they were addressed to Christ at His baptism, 'Thou art My beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased,' while Matthew's version gives the substance, 'This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' It is just possible that both sentences were spoken, one to Christ, the other to John. Or we may consider that, as on another occasion, the voice from heaven sounded as thunder to some, as the voice of an angel to others, but as a distinct utterance to Christ; so here the heavenly sound fell on Christ's ear as addressed to Him, 'Thou art,' while it reached John's ear as 'This is My beloved Son.' I need not give other instances, as there is always a difficulty in deciding which one may give the full



and exact report. But the one who gives the exact words is guided by the Spirit in doing so, and the one who only gives the substance of the words in another form is, we believe, equally guided by the Spirit, and each account is alike verbally inspired. Just as a man might send a full report of his sermon to one paper, and might also give to another a summary of the same; each would be the work of the man, and the words, though differing in many instances, would be his words in both cases. The Spirit by one man gives us a full report, and by another chooses simply to give the substance of it; where is the incongruity in holding both to be fully inspired?

4. *There are cases where no one writer may give the exact words, but each one gives his own Spirit-taught interpretation of them.* This allows for the different setting given to certain passages, the application of the truth in various ways to the differing circumstances of the readers. In this way some would explain the version which Luke gives of what is called the Sermon on the Mount, and if it may not be classed, as I have suggested, under the first heading, I should agree with them in this. Certainly I believe it is so with other passages. This has been called an 'abandoning of the contention for strict accuracy as guaranteed by Verbal Inspiration,' and attributing to the writers 'coloured versions of the words of Christ.' Substitute for 'coloured version,' with its evil suggestiveness, the expression 'Spirit-taught version,' and there is no inconsistency with 'Verbal Inspiration.' This has also been called an 'acceptance of the tendency theory of Higher Criticism.' But we submit there is a wide difference between the two positions. In brief, the 'Tendency theory' is a case of 'coloured versions' adapted

to certain circumstances, designed to reconcile certain sections, or to give support to the development of doctrines in accord with varying tastes. But we hold that the variant versions of Christ's words, which have a real application to varying circumstances, were not made by any individual writer's caprice, were not coloured by his native idiosyncrasies, were not adapted by his fancy to meet what he thought the special needs of his times or to advance his own ends; but were all inspired, directed, controlled, given under the gracious and infallible influence of that Spirit of truth promised by Christ to His disciples. Once admit Inspiration in the *variation*, and you rise above this kind of objection.

It is abundantly clear that each Evangelist did write with a special object in view. It is a fair, though not exhaustive, summary of their different standpoints to say that Matthew represents Christ as the Son of David, the King of Israel; Mark, as the Servant of God; Luke, as the Son of man with a world-wide outlook; John, as the Son of God, in whom is the fulness of life and eternal blessing. It is not surprising, it is what might be expected, that they should each give a setting to the words of Christ, and so marshal the facts of their narrative as to give emphasis to their special aim, in all this being *taught of the Spirit*. For, after all, what a monotonous affair it would have been had each Evangelist recorded exactly the same things in exactly the same words. We might just as well have had one Gospel. God has chosen to give us four Gospels—a fourfold view of the one all-perfect life. They were meant to be different, else they would not have been given, and if God has given them at all, then He has given them in their diversity, and the same Spirit worketh amid all the diversity.

And though we have spoken more especially of the differences in the Gospels, the same class of phenomena meets us elsewhere. In the Pentateuch, with its varying versions of laws and institutions; in the historical books of the Old Testament; in the Prophets and the Psalms; and equally so in the Acts and Epistles. Absolute uniformity is never found in God's Universe; we need not expect it in God's Book. But just as really as there is amid all Nature's diversity a glorious unity, so, amid all the diversity in the Bible, there is unbreakable unity. The *Diversity* is as much the work of the Divine Spirit as the *Unity*. In all the 'sundry times,' and amid all the 'divers manners' of Scripture revelation, it is the ONE GOD WHO SPEAKS.

The next objection we notice is that founded upon the *manner in which the New Testament writers quote from the Old*. It is contended that inasmuch as they are not always particular about giving the exact words, it is evident that the words could not be inspired. Now it is a fact, and in this discussion we wish to blink no fact, that there is a very large amount of freedom shown in these New Testament quotations from the Old. The writers often quote from the Septuagint version, which no one claims to be inspired, which in many respects is very faulty; sometimes they follow it exactly; sometimes they give an exact rendering of the Hebrew; sometimes they give a translation which is not an exact rendering of either the Hebrew or the Septuagint.

Can this practice be explained in harmony with the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration? We believe that it can. In the first place, we may say a word about the use of a translation, inasmuch as it is sometimes objected that Verbal Inspiration attaching to the original could not be

preserved in a translation. While it is admitted that no translation can fully express the force of the original, yet a translation can be so accurate as to leave practically no doubt that it does convey the meaning of the original. If you begin with an Inspired MS., Inspired both as to thought and language, you can be sure that in the correct translation you are giving the mind of the Spirit; but if the original is not Inspired as to the language, you have first the great difficulty of correctly ascertaining the thought hidden behind the language, and then the difficulty of reflecting the spirit of that thought in a new language. The words, however, being Inspired, as we believe they were, you have the Divine thought embodied in Divinely chosen or approved language, and there is then no difficulty in transmuting that thought into other languages without any uncertainty. The only concern is to render the words accurately, and for this mere scholarship suffices. It is noteworthy that some of the best translations of the Scriptures have been made by men of a rationalistic tendency, who possessed the supreme qualification of thoroughly knowing the original languages. Now any faithful translation may be quoted as the Word of God. We have no hesitation in saying to an inquirer, This is the veritable Word of God: 'God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have everlasting life'; we scruple not to say, This is the Inspired declaration of the Apostle, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved'; although we know that not the English words, but the Greek equivalent of these words were the words given by Inspiration of God. So the Lord and His Apostles could freely quote

from the Septuagint Version (where it faithfully reflected the meaning of the original)—a version which, I apprehend, even our most junior brethren know was made at Alexandria some two and a half centuries B. C., and was generally used by the Greek-speaking Jews of Christ's day. Now this version being in common use, it was natural that the Apostles should use it in speaking or writing to those familiar with it; just as any English preacher now would quote his English Bible or a German his German version, or a Frenchman the French version. For them to quote the Septuagint, even where it did not very accurately express the Hebrew, no more implied that they did not consider the original Verbally Inspired than Mr. Spurgeon's quoting the English Bible could be used to prove that he did not believe in Verbal Inspiration. But suppose that a preacher who wished to be very accurate in referring to a certain passage should, knowing that the English version was not sufficiently literal, give the exact rendering of the original, that would not show that he considered it immaterial what words were used, but that his very anxiety to give the exact meaning of the passage led him to depart from the translation. Now, this is exactly what we have in regard to many of the quotations. The Septuagint is followed where it faithfully represents the original; but where it deviates from it, the writer leaves the version and gives a more accurate rendering of the Hebrew. If anything is to be proved from this, it surely is that the New Testament writers were anxious to give the very meaning of the passages, because they believed these to be Verbally Inspired.

The cases where the quotations are made directly from the Hebrew, of course, occasion no difficulty; but there are

cases where neither the Septuagint nor the Hebrew is closely followed, and cases where the Septuagint differs considerably from the Hebrew, and yet is followed. I need not stop to give instances of these various usages, but hasten to say how we explain them. First of all, then, we say that where the substance of the Old Testament passage is given, albeit in slightly different words, there need be no doubt thrown on the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration. For while we maintain that not only the thoughts, but the words of Scripture partake of Inspiration, we admit that the all-important matter for us is to learn the *thoughts* of Scripture; but just because we believe in the importance of the thought, do we feel the necessity for having it correctly expressed. But we are not so wedded to the verbal expression as to believe that the same thought must always be expressed in the same words. For example, no one would contend that in setting forth the Gospel to a sinner it is essential to state it in the very words of Scripture; for although every Christian worker must know, that in dealing with souls there is an inexpressible charm about a Gospel text when spoken in *ipsissimis verbis*, yet the truth contained in John iii. 16 may be so expressed in our own words as to bring blessing to a sin-laden soul. Here we are sure of the thought, because we are sure of the *Scriptural expression* of it, and can easily render it into our language without much loss. Now, surely in the same way, though with a difference which we shall presently notice, the writers of the New Testament could take up these Old Testament Scriptures, and in their own language give the substance of the Spirit-expressed thought. It was not essential to the preservation of the Inspiration that they should always quote *verbatim*. This is, however, very



different from the contention of our opponents. They say the substance, the thought of the passage, was the only thing inspired; it mattered not for the language; hence, the New Testament writers did not need to be particular about the words. We hold, too, that the substance, the thought, is the *essential* thing, but we do not see how, in the first instance, the thought could be rightly expressed or correctly apprehended apart from the medium of inspired language. Once the thought was given by Inspiration, given in the 'words which the Holy Ghost teacheth,' these men of God could readily render that thought in other language; but their evident concern in many instances to give the exact terms of Scripture, and to avoid using the Septuagint where it gave a wrong expression of the thought, shows convincingly that they had a very high regard for the very words of Holy writ, 'the sacred letters.' Again we observe, and this applies more especially to the cases where the Septuagint in its divergence from the Hebrew is adopted, that the words of Scripture are so full, the thoughts of God are so deep, that it is no wonder if it takes several renderings to exhaust the meaning. No one can study closely the Hebrew or Greek of the Scriptures without often feeling the inadequacy of one word to express all that the Scriptural term involves, and so we are driven to use different words, each giving a different phase of the meaning. Specially would this be the case with Christ and His Apostles, who could *see* more fully into the Scriptural depths than we can, and who might well see that in some of these passages the Septuagint version had taken up one phase of the meaning, which they could very well endorse, while at the same time accepting the literal truth of the Hebrew in its ordinary interpretation.

That most perplexing passage perhaps of all, in Heb. x. 5, may be thus explained. The Septuagint version is there quoted, 'A body hast Thou prepared Me.' The Hebrew of the fortieth Psalm being, as rendered in our version, 'Mine ears hast Thou opened,' or in the margin, 'Hast Thou digged,' or bored. At first sight they seem very different, and yet the Septuagint is endorsed by the writer of the Epistle, the words being put in the lips of the coming Christ Himself. Looked at closely, however, we may see a point of harmony. The expression in the Hebrew may refer to the custom of boring the ear of the servant who refused to go out free, but elected to spend his days in perpetual servitude to the master whom he loved; or it may refer simply to the fact that among the Hebrews to *open* or *uncover* the ear was a customary expression for revealing, including the idea of '*listening to a communication followed by prompt obedience.*' Now, whichever idea is alluded to in the Hebrew phrase, it is manifest that it means service—ready, loving service; and the phrase in the Septuagint, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as applied to Christ, means exactly this: 'A body hast Thou prepared Me'; for what purpose? Surely that in it He might serve and suffer; serve by suffering; He 'took on Him the form of a servant.' And when we add that the word 'ear' may well be used metonymically for 'body,' the part for the whole, it is plain, I think, that while the divergence in expression is so great, there is no actual disharmony in the thought, but a more vivid and realistic way of expressing the same thought, that of the absolute surrender of the Christ of God to a life of perfect consecration to the Divine Will. In illustration of the same point, we might refer to the well-known theological truth

known as the double sense of prophecy, and so we have often a double, yea, a manifold, application of the prophetic word in the New Testament quotations. And because of this depth, this manifoldness of meaning in the Sacred Word, we find that in some cases one writer may quote, to enforce a truth, or explain an event, a passage as given in the Septuagint, while another writer will quote the self-same passage in another connection as it appears in the Hebrew.

I may mention one case, too, as typical of others where you have the quotation from the Septuagint by one writer, and the substance, or rather a deeper meaning, of the Hebrew given by another. In Matt. xiii. 14, 15 you have a passage given as part of Christ's speech from the Septuagint version of Isa. vi. 9, 10, which here closely follows the Hebrew, and the same passage is so quoted in the last chapter of Acts. But in John xii. 40, Jesus, speaking on another occasion, is represented as quoting the same passage, but this time with a difference; the mood and tense of the verbs are changed and different verbs used: 'He hath blinded their eyes, and He hardened their hearts.' There is a decided difference, and it does not seem warranted as a literal translation of the Hebrew; but who shall say that Christ acted unwarrantably, and that He did not, in giving this rendering, bring out more fully the meaning involved in the Hebrew, especially in view of the circumstances of the men to whom He spake?

I hold, then, that these are two legitimate explanations of these differences, viz., that the thought once expressed in the Old Testament in Divinely-given language might fairly be rendered, as to its substance, in other words; and that there is such a fulness of meaning in the Word of God,

that it is capable of more than one form of expression. But I hasten to add a consideration, to which I attach still more importance, which gives additional force to these suggestions, while it is in itself sufficient to account for all the phenomena. It is simply this, that, *The same Spirit which inspired the Old Testament inspired the writers of the New to quote the Old in the way they have quoted it.* Thus, in giving the substance of the Old Testament thought in other words, they were not following their own fancies, but the guidance of the Spirit; in adopting, as expressing the mind of the Spirit, a divergent rendering of the Septuagint, or giving an unusual interpretation of the Hebrew, they were not using their native judgment, but they were giving the judgment of the Spirit. The Spirit who first gave the Word might surely be allowed the liberty of guiding them to adopt as correct a particular expression of His own thought, or to give a new rendering of it, to bring out a fuller meaning, before unsuspected, or even to breathe into the old expression a new meaning. As an author in quoting his own statements may modify them or express them differently, so surely the Spirit of God, the Author of the Old Testament, might lead the writers of the New, not only literally to quote, but also, on occasion, to modify, amplify, or differently express the earlier statements; and yet, as in the case of the human expressions, the first and the second would alike be the words of the author, the various expressions be the work of the Spirit, and Inspired by Him.

Another objection is sometimes advanced which need not detain us long. It is founded on the declaration of Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 25, 'I have no commandment of the Lord, but I give my judgment as one who hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful.' It is contended that the

section following cannot be Inspired, and that if it is so with this portion, it may be equally true of many other sections. Now, of course, if there were any force in this objection, it would be not simply against the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration, but against *any* Inspiration as applied to these passages. If Paul's disclaimer is to be understood as the objectors understand it, then he disclaims any Inspiration at all for these sections. Is it right thus to interpret the Apostle's words? Remember that his general claim is to absolute Inspiration; even in this very epistle he claims to speak the things of God in words which the Spirit teacheth; and, then, look at the words, 'I have no commandment of the Lord.' Throughout this chapter Paul is dealing with matters concerning some of which no clear injunctions had before been given, but as to others the moral law had clearly defined the duty. In the sixth verse he says, 'This I say by way of permission, not of commandment.' There was no direct commandment from God that any man should remain unmarried, but, in the particular circumstances of that time, Paul was permitted to give this injunction, that they should remain as he was. But surely the permission, if from God, is as much Inspired as the command. Then he proceeds, 'But unto the married I command, yea, not I, but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband.' He gave the charge with the full authority of his Inspired Apostolate, but even as he writes the words he bears in mind the fact that it is not simply a question of expediency, of permissive conduct in view of certain emergencies, but is an integral part of the moral law, and especially of the teaching of Christ, 'Yea, not I, but the Lord.' That is evidently, Not *I alone*; not I now

for the first time, but *also* the Lord Himself, who gave the law on Sinai, the Lord who in the days of His flesh expressed this very injunction. Then, when he goes on to deal with the case of a Christian having an unbelieving partner, he says, 'For the rest say I, not the Lord,' evidently meaning that there had been no special commandment given before of this nature; no express injunction of the Lord Jesus to which he could appeal; indeed, the analogy of the Old Testament injunction enforced by Ezra, as to the putting away of Gentile wives, would rather be against it; but it would manifestly be wrong to take it as if his injunction were without Divine authority. When he says before, 'Not I, but the Lord,' having just said that he *does* give the command, he must mean, Not I absolutely; and so when he says, 'I, not the Lord,' we are bound to interpret in the same way 'not the Lord' as meaning not specifically, not except through his words. It is utterly impossible to understand him as meaning that he does not speak with Divine authority, since in reference to this particular matter he adds, 'And so ordain I in all the Churches,' and his full Apostolic authority could, of course, only spring from his Inspiration. Now, coming to the other passage, which follows close upon this, it must be interpreted in the same way, 'I have no commandment of the Lord'; no explicit word had been spoken by the Lord Jesus on the subject, but when he adds, 'but I give my judgment,' he surely means his judgment as an Inspired Apostle, 'as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful,' referring undoubtedly to the fact that it was according to the mercy of God that he had been called to the Apostleship, and, as faithful to his trust, he now speaks; and throughout the



chapter all that he says on this topic, though thus modestly introduced, is couched in the tones of authority. Then, at the close, he says, 'After my judgment, and I think I also have the Spirit of God,' words that are sometimes taken to imply a doubt of the fact, but which, properly considered, are a strong, though indirect, claim to the possession of the Spirit. It is, I 'deem' myself to have the Spirit; or, I seem to have the Spirit—not seeming as opposed to reality, but seeming as growing out of the evidence. The same word is used in the fifteenth of Acts of the deliberate and important decision of the Council at Jerusalem, 'It *seemed* good to the Apostles and the Elders, with the whole Church, to choose men,' etc. Here is the very opposite of any doubt as to their decision. Again, in their letter, 'It seemed good unto us,' and when stating the emphatic decision arrived at under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, they use no stronger term than this, 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.' And, in the next chapter, their decisions are called decrees, a cognate word with this. So that Paul really means that he has *come to the decision* that he has the Spirit of God. Was he right or wrong in that decision? It is not an opinion which may or may not be questioned; it is his deliberate belief; and he had the best reason for knowing whether or not he had the Spirit of God. For a man possessed by the Spirit of God, as he was, to say concerning any particular utterance, 'I think I have the Spirit of God,' is equivalent to the testimony of the Spirit to the fact of the possession of the Spirit. Otherwise, would it not have been unwarrantable presumption in him, yea, intolerable blasphemy; to set his uninspired dictum on a level with, and even in opposition to, the 'commandment of the Lord'?

## LECTURE XVI.

### VARIOUS READINGS IN MSS., AND POSSIBLE ERRORS IN TRANSCRIPTION.—GENERAL SUMMARY.

WE have only to look at one more difficulty—viz., ‘*How does the question of various readings in MSS., and possible errors of transcription, affect the doctrine of Plenary and Verbal Inspiration?*’ There is the undeniable fact that we have various readings. How came they there? Manifestly through the slips of scribes. The variations are, however, comparatively trifling, and far less than might have been expected: while the way in which the text has been preserved by Divine Providence is nothing short of wonderful, and calls for our devout thanksgiving. The Revised Version, for instance, follows MSS. that are at the furthest remove from the MSS. followed by the Authorised Version; yet the result is that there is no variation that at all affects any *matter* of doctrine or Christian practice—nothing, indeed, that at all changes the body of the Christian faith. It is very desirable to get as near as possible to the original text, and to help us in this is the function of Criticism. And here let me say that Orthodox Christianity has never been opposed to legitimate Criticism. We believe in Criticism when kept in its proper place, for, as Westcott says of legitimate Criticism, ‘The laws of Criticism are absolute, and the Christian may rely with confidence upon

the results.' Some of the most eminent Critics have been most devout Christians and believers in Full Inspiration. What we do object to and repudiate is the baseless arrogance of the so-called Higher Criticism which, not content with sifting the evidence for the ascertaining of the text, takes upon itself to criticise that text when found, to sit in judgment on the matter of revelation, to profess to expound the methods of composition in a way derogatory to Inspiration, and to ignore entirely the Divine element in the Scriptures. That is departing from the function of true Criticism. It is as if an editor of Plato should take upon him to correct Plato's philosophy, or an annotator of Shakespeare follow the methods of Ignatius Donnelly. Criticism may lead the way to the Palace of Truth, or may sweep the dust from the doorstep; but it has no right to dismantle the Throne-room, or disannul the mandates of the King. Throughout these lectures, we have used the terms 'Higher Critics' and 'Critics' to denote that phase of hostile Criticism which is becoming so offensively aggressive in these days, to avoid the awkward circumlocution of 'so-called,' though it might be more correct to refer to them as 'naturalistic,' or 'rationalistic critics and criticism.' But while thus necessarily speaking against that kind of Criticism, we are not opponents of True Criticism.

The business of Criticism is to fix the exact text; our contention is that the text itself is Inspired in its language as well as in its thought. Of every part of the ascertained text, we predicate Plenary and Verbal Inspiration.

It is asked, If Verbal Inspiration only attaches to the original text, what is the value of it? The same thing must apply to every theory of Inspiration. Whatever kind of

Inspiration is claimed, it could only be the original autographs which were Inspired. But while we may have some difficulty in ascertaining in a few instances what was the exact language used; on the other theories there would be in addition to that the difficulty of knowing whether we could be sure of the thought as originally expressed. If the original was, as we believe, Verbally Inspired, then the only thing is to ascertain as nearly as possible what that was. But because there is some difficulty in ascertaining with absolute precision every detail of the early text, is that any reason for saying, 'It doesn't matter for the language, only let us be sure of the Inspired thought'? Do men reason so with regard to other ancient MSS.? Are scholars content to say concerning the works of Plato and Horace, etc., 'It doesn't matter whether we have the words as they were written; let us only seek to get the thought'? Why all the labours of commentators on the ancient classics, if it were not felt that it is essential to a thorough understanding of these books to get, as exactly as possible, the original texts? And where they cannot be sure of the true reading, there can be no absolute certainty of the thought expressed by the writer. And so with the Scripture text, in proportion to the integrity of the language will be the apprehension of the thought. We can only reach the thought through the language.

Then, again, they say it is an *a priori* assumption on our part that the original MSS. were Verbally Inspired and without error. But we maintain that is not so. We make no assumptions with regard to this matter. We take the evidence given in Scripture, and from that we reach the conclusion that the MSS. were Verbally Inspired. Christ

and His Apostles have, as we believe, declared that Inspiration is a matter of words as well as thoughts. And in the face of that evidence, it is worse than an *a priori* assumption on the part of our opponents to say that the original MSS. were infected with error. It is saying that all Scripture was *not* given by Inspiration of God; it is saying that God gave a Revelation tainted with error; a Standard with no Infallible authority; a Guide that was not capable of leading unerringly. We hold that God's Revelation is perfect; that every word of God is pure; that the Standard is Infallible; that the Guide is unerring. Where is the *a priori* assumption in that? It is simply echoing the inspired statement that all Scripture, given by inspiration of God, is profitable for correction, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete—completely furnished unto every good work. But how can a book in itself fallible, tainted with error, and incomplete, make the man of God complete in all the will of God, and furnish him completely unto every good work?

Now, while we speak of the inspiration of the original, we are not speaking of something that is hopelessly lost, and for ever out of our reach. While it is admitted that the actual autographs are lost, we believe that we have practically the contents of those autographs still. They themselves are lost. God has permitted that. He has not wrought a miracle to preserve them. He gave the Word to men in its purity, and left to them the responsibility of preserving it untarnished. Perhaps it is as well that the autographs are lost; just as Moses' tomb might have led to idolatry had it been known, and as the brazen serpent had to be destroyed because of the tendency to worship it, so,

doubtless, if these MSS. had been in existence, they would have been elevated into a kind of Christian Palladium; and as every supposed relic of the Saviour has been worshipped, so there would have been in reality what our opponents are fond of attributing to us—*Bibliolatry*. But be that as it may, all the same, we do assert the virtual identity of the present Bible with the original; and in that contention even our opponents declare that we have the support of criticism, for ‘that science has gone a long way in bringing back to us the text of the original autographs.’ We quite accept the statement of a recent writer when he says, ‘Leaving aside little verbal points, numbers, and dates, which may have got into confusion here and there, etc., we have *in the main the genuine Scriptures*.’ Therefore he says ‘the errors must be attributed to those Scriptures.’ But here we join issue, not in denying that ‘the errors must be attributed to those Scriptures,’ but in denying that, apart from the points he has excepted, there are any errors. We believe that the alleged discrepancies, and so-called mistakes in historical and scientific matters, and fancied departures from morality, are all reconcilable with the hypothesis of perfect accuracy; so that we have only left the few possible mistakes on ‘little verbal points, etc.’ These do not, even in the opinion of one so widely at variance with us as the writer above quoted, constitute any real difficulty, nor need they be considered as weakening the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration.

We have spoken of the variations in the MSS. as trivial; and so, for the most part, they are, being generally a difference in a tense of a verb, in the case of a noun, in the person or number of a pronoun, in the presence or absence of a preposition or an article, all of which variations might make



scarcely a perceptible difference in the meaning, while often the difference is simply one of spelling or of the arrangement of the words. For instance, I open at random Scrivener's Greek Testament, which gives all the various readings at the foot of the page. I find twenty-three alterations marked, which is perhaps rather above the average. Looking at them, I find the 1st is the change of the preposition *εἰς* into *ἐν*, with the corresponding change of the accusative case into the dative. 2. Is the omission of the particle *ἄν*. 3. A present indicative for an aorist subjunctive. 4. Simply a difference of a letter in the spelling of a word. 5. Present tense for the future. 6. A compound negative for the simple. 7. The omission of a phrase which occurs in the following verse. 8. A difference of tense, first aorist for second. 9. The omission of the pronoun, which is, of course, included in the verb. 10. Simply a difference in the order of a word or two. 11. Omission of the article. 12. A word bracketed doubtful by one editor. 13. Omission of adverb 'therefore' and article. 14. Omission of conjunction. 15. Addition of a letter to a conjunction, which leaves the word unaltered. 16. The giving of two particles as one word instead of two. 17. A difference in the order of a word. 18. The future tense for the present. 19. A difference in tense. 20. A difference in punctuation. 21. Omission of conjunction. 22. A different form of the pronoun. 23. A different arrangement of the words in a clause.

Now, these are a fair specimen of the whole, and, remember, it does not mean that there is absolute uncertainty with regard to these readings. In many cases the evidence is so strong in favour that we accept them without hesitation, as the Revisers have accepted them, and incorporated

them into the text. Others of them are supported by only one or two editors, and may, with little doubt, be rejected, while a few have the evidence about equally balanced as between them and the *Textus Receptus*. Now, of course, with regard to these matters, even our opponents would not charge the text with error; they would simply say that they cannot be absolutely certain which reading is the original one; but, whatever be the nature of the Inspiration in which they believe, they would maintain that only the reading which really represents the original is *Inspired*. And that is exactly our position. It is not a question of *Verbal Inspiration* merely, but of Inspiration *per se*, as attaching to the original. Which is the original? Of that, when ascertained, we predicate Inspiration, and, as we hold, Verbal Inspiration, but the difficulty, such as it is, must be the same for our opponents as for ourselves. Be it remembered, however, that in very many cases it matters nothing, even as to the letter, which reading is adopted, since it is simply a question of spelling, or of the order of the words, involving no difference in the words themselves. Then, as to very many more, the difference is microscopic, and it is only in regard to a very few passages that a reading of some importance is doubtful. Now, as to these passages, we simply suspend judgment; we need have no doubt that whatever was written was Inspired, and we may be sure that one of the two readings was written, but as to which was actually the word used by the author we have not *absolute certainty*; but when we have both the original and the variation, we can be practically certain of the meaning, especially when in so many cases there is so very little change of meaning involved

As to what may be called actual errors of transcription, I need say little. These are generally 'little verbal points, as numbers and dates.' The most familiar instances are such as these. The one as to the age of Ahaziah, 2 Kings viii. 26 giving it as twenty-two, while 2 Chron. xxii. 2 gives forty-two. The mistake is evident, and the material for correction lies in the context itself, for the Chronicler, in the twenty-first chapter, tells us that his father died at the age of forty, so that surely this mistake cannot be charged upon the author, for although the Higher Critics have a remarkably low opinion of the Chronicler's literary powers, I cannot imagine that they would think he could proceed to such an extremity of stupidity as to represent a man as being two years older than his own father.

This mistake, and other mistakes in numbers, evidently arose from the custom of expressing numbers by letters, and, as you know how much alike certain Hebrew letters are, it is not much wonder that the scribes sometimes confounded one with the other. In this instance twenty-two would be represented by כב, while מב would represent forty-two, the difference being between כ and מ, letters which are not very much alike as we know them, but it seems that the ancient form of מ was more like כ, thus כִּי. There is another passage where these two letters seem to have been confounded, Neh. vii. 44, which gives the number of the children of Asaph as one hundred and forty-eight, whereas Ezra ii. 41 gives one hundred and twenty-eight. Again, in 1 Chron. xxi. 12, three years' famine is mentioned as one of the punishments offered to David, whereas in 2 Sam. xxiv. 13, the number seven is given; the confusion of two similar letters, ג and ה, one meaning three and the other

seven, would account for this. I may mention that the Septuagint in both cases gives three years, so that here we have at hand a means of correcting the text. In 2 Sam. viii. 4, we read that David took from Hadadezer a thousand chariots and seven hundred horsemen, while in 1 Chron. xviii. 4, the number is given as one thousand chariots and seven thousand horsemen. Now, we might say that there is here no absolute contradiction, as it is not said in Samuel that *only* seven hundred horsemen were taken, and the account in Chronicles might include others that were not contemplated in the other account. But a slight error of the copyist would make the difference; the final *Nun* (נ) stands for seven hundred, whereas *Zain*, which is remarkably like it, stands, with a dot over it (ז), for seven thousand. We have some evidence that originally it was seven thousand in both cases; the Septuagint in both passages gives 'one thousand chariots and seven thousand horsemen,' and Josephus says 'about seven thousand.'

In 1 Sam. xii. 11, the name 'Bedan' is given, while in a similar enumeration in Heb. xi., 'Barak' appears. In view of the well-known fact that many Scripture characters have several names, it may be that Barak also bore the name of Bedan. Among other suggestions, it is not unworthy of notice that the Chaldee paraphrast renders it Samson, as if Bedan equalled *Ben Dan*, the son of Dan, the Danite. However, as the Septuagint here has Barak, and, according to the margin of the Revised Version, 'some ancient authorities read Barak,' it is not unlikely that it is an instance of a scribal error. There are a few other cases of a different sort, e. g., the negative particle אֵין, 'not,' where we ought to read יָהּ, 'to him'; but here the marginal reading of the Hebrew comes to our aid.

Now, not to pursue this work of dry detailed examination, which is more suited for private study—and you will find the matter dealt with pretty fully in Dr. Angus's 'Bible Handbook'—I maintain that the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration is not affected by these mistakes. As I have said before, we ought to be very slow in admitting such mistakes, and only when we cannot explain the passages in any other way, sometimes not then; or when the context itself indicates the mistake, ought we to admit them; but when admitted they are reckoned as manifestly variations from the text as written, and so they do not contradict the fact that the text as written was *Verbally* Inspired. It has been suggested that many of the variations of the Septuagint from the Hebrew may be accounted for by supposing that the translators had read the Hebrew words differently, and that is quite likely. There are several passages which can be explained in that way; there is the well-known example of the rendering of Gen. xlvii. 31, which is adopted in Heb. xi. 21, Jacob leaning upon the top of his 'staff,' whereas the Hebrew, as at present pointed and translated by our version, instead of staff gives 'bed.' It is, however, quite conceivable that Jacob, in leaning upon the top of his 'bed,' not bedstead, for bedsteads were not common in the East, leaned upon his staff, and the Apostle, guided by the Spirit, adopts the Septuagint rendering as bringing out this additional fact.

It has been asked, if once we admit that there are some errors of transcription such as these in reference to the numbers, how are we to know but that there may be other mistakes with regard to important facts and doctrines. The answer to that is that the mistakes are few and well-

defined. The very careful character of the transcription secures the general accuracy. The scribes were in the habit of counting the letters in each book, reckoning how many times each particular letter occurred, and so on, so that it is next to impossible that any mistake of importance could find place. Even Dr. Robertson-Smith is constrained to admit the great care of the scribes. He says that 'they devoted the most strict and punctilious attention to the exact transmission of the received text, down to the smallest peculiarity of spelling, and even to certain irregularities of writing. When the standard MS. had a letter too big or a letter too small, the copies made from it imitated even this, so that letters of an unusual size appear in the same place in every Hebrew Bible. Nay, the scrupulousness of the transcribers went still further. In the old MSS., when a copyist had omitted a letter . . . and when the error was detected as the copy was revised, the reviser inserted the missing letter above the line, as we should now do with a caret. If, on the other hand, the reviser found that any superfluous letter had been inserted, he cancelled it by pricking a dot above it. All this shows with what punctilious accuracy the one standard copy was followed.' When such an advanced and destructive critic as Robertson-Smith is obliged to admit so much, we may be sure that the possibility of mistake is reduced to a minimum. These minute flaws, then, upon our present copies of the Bible do not really affect the question at all. We can still consider the Bible as a whole as the Inspired and Infallible Book of God.

You will notice that I have used the phrase *Verbal* Inspiration more frequently than 'Absolute Inerrancy.'



My reason for so doing is that, because these trifling mistakes are admitted, it may seem somewhat inconsistent to claim at the same time 'absolute inerrancy' for the Bible as we have it; it seems like saying that there are mistakes, but there are no mistakes. Now, of course, I believe that Verbal Inspiration *includes* Absolute Inerrancy, as regards *the writings originally given*, and I think that usually, when Inerrancy has been mentioned, it has been in opposition to the idea that there are scientific, historical, or ethical mistakes in the Scriptures, or that there are absolute discrepancies and contradictions. It is almost like a quibble to bring up these cases of scribal errors, admitted all along by the advocates of the Infallibility of Scripture, and use them for the purpose of showing that the Scriptures are not Inerrant. No one has ever said that these mistakes were part of the Inerrancy of Scripture, but they have ever been looked upon as the small dust of the balance. Let 'Absolute Inerrancy' be used to mean, as it has generally meant, that the Bible is Verbally Inspired and free from all error in doctrine, history, science, ethics, and philosophy, and we do strenuously contend for it.

Still, in view of the quibbling about words, I prefer the good old phrase *Verbal Inspiration*. It was with that we commenced; we have sought to define it, we have endeavoured to prove it, we have tried to defend it from various objections; and it was before the recent discussion about Inerrancy commenced that we undertook to deal with the objections to Verbal Inspiration. That work has occupied me much longer than I supposed it would, but I trust the time spent upon it has not been spent in vain.

We have examined very closely the testimony borne by Christ to the Old Testament; we have seen that His use of it proves its Authority and Inspiration, and also the extent of that Inspiration as reaching to the language. We have considered the bearing of Christ's testimony upon the theories of the Higher Critics, and have found that their conclusions as to the Authorship of certain books, the Origin of certain Institutions, and the general Historical character of the Old Testament, are utterly opposed to the teaching of Christ. We, therefore, do not hesitate to cast them aside as worthless.

We have noted the evidence for the Inspiration of the Apostles, and having examined their testimony to the Old Testament, we find that it is in harmony with the testimony of Christ in regard to all the foregoing particulars; and we think we do well to prefer the Apostles to the New Critics.

We have seen that the Full Inspiration of thought and language which the Apostles attribute to the Old Testament they also claim for their own writings; and passing backward to the Old Testament, we have found that the conclusions based upon New Testament evidence are amply confirmed by the phenomena of the Old. We have seen that Moses and the prophets claim to have the same kind of Inspiration, and that the written Word as possessed, and increased, from age to age, was ever held in reverence, and appealed to as the Infallible Standard.

We have considered somewhat the question of the connection between thought and language as supplying a metaphysical argument in favour of Verbal Inspiration; have sought to vindicate our doctrine from the charge of being 'mechanical'; have dwelt upon the distinction

between Inspiration and Revelation; and have noted the importance of words as supplying the basis for the formation of theological doctrines.

In seeking to answer *seriatim* the many objections brought against the view we hold, we have sought to shirk no difficulty, to ignore no fact, however much it might seem to tell against us; and if we have not been successful in solving every difficulty, we trust enough has been said to lead to the belief that the difficulties are not insoluble. We admit that our view is not absolutely free from difficulty, just as no doctrine of the Word is quite free from difficulty; but we hold that the difficulties that beset other theories are of a much graver character. We have sought incidentally to show that many of the difficulties, which are thought to belong only to the Plenary theory, do, more or less, apply to the other theories, while all of them have this ruinous defect, that they leave us with no certainty as to what the Word of God really is.

It has been said that it is the theory of Plenary Inspiration that is on its trial. We are not afraid but what it will stand the test, as hitherto it has stood other tests. But I think we may say that the other theories have had their trial; 'they have been weighed in the balances and found wanting.'

The doctrine of Degrees of Inspiration cannot satisfy all the requirements of the case, and has no support in Scripture.

The idea that Inspiration is to be conceived as only pertaining to the facts recorded leads practically to the denial of all real Inspiration. It admits not only of fallible and faulty reports, full of misconceptions, mistakes, and contradictions, but also of false interpretations of Scripture,

and mistaken views of doctrinal truth. Thus Dr. Horton speaks of the inexactness 'of Paul's quotations, and the interpretation often quite *unjustified* by the original context which he puts upon the venerable words.' 'To cite him as an exegete of the ancient Scriptures would be obviously absurd. His method of using them is essentially rabbinical . . . he will employ a Targum, as it were, on a text, and thereby read into it a *totally irrelevant* meaning.' His illustration about the Law in Gal. iv. 'is singularly confusing.' His argument about the word 'seed' is a specimen of 'Rabbinical hair-splitting.' If 'subsequent thinkers' have not given a better 'interpretation of the Christian facts,' it is partly because they 'have been overshadowed by his authority.' We do not think it needful to refute such statements; we give them just to show to what extremities Dr. Horton's theory leads him; but we feel that every Christian who has any intelligent conception of the Divine Authority of Holy Scripture will repudiate such unworthy sentiments. Of old even the personal opponents of the great Apostle were obliged to confess that 'his letters are weighty and powerful'; and despite the autocratic dictum of this modern theorist, we believe that Paul's letters are still 'weighty and powerful,' because invested throughout with Divine Authority.

The theory that attributes Inspiration to the spiritual teaching alone, but denies it to the historical, must fail to satisfy anyone who has any adequate conception of the immense importance of the historical element in the Word of God.

The various phases of the partial theory which have of late been brought before us fail to satisfy us. Thus one

who admits all sorts of mistakes in the writings of the Evangelists, and yet perhaps goes farther in asserting Inspiration than many of his school, has expressed his idea of Inspiration: 'It throbs in every book of Scripture, and flashes out of almost every page'; 'it is the breath of the Spirit of Christ.' 'The truth—that is, the essential teaching of the Bible, its spiritual truth searches our hearts and consciences, claiming our assent by its invariable majesty.' How it can throb in the book, and flash out of the page, without being attached to the language is a mystery to me. But the high-sounding phrases, when examined, simply express the old exploded idea that the Bible is inspired in so far as it finds us, lays hold of us, and awakens an echo in our soul. Here it is not the Word that is 'the judge that ends the strife,' but man is the judge of the Word. We admit that in the theory there is a modicum of truth. We believe that the truth of the Bible does find an echo in the heart of man; that it commends itself to the *unprejudiced* judgment, and reason, and conscience of men. And especially when a man has believed the Word, and through the Word come into harmony and fellowship with the living Christ whom the Word reveals, and from that Christ has received His Spirit, will that Word find a constant echo in his soul; it will ever commend itself to his conscience; his eyes, opened by the Spirit of Truth, will see wondrous things out of God's law; and the Spirit within will bear witness to the voice of the Spirit in the Word.

But that is not what the theory means. It is that the Word proves its Inspiration to each man according as it *inspires* him; that whatever he recognises as the voice of God to his soul is essential and spiritual truth; that, as

Dr. Clifford puts it in his book on Inspiration, 'The Bible inspires me, therefore it is inspired.' We hold that such a fancy utterly fails to give certitude to Christian doctrine, or rest to doubting souls. What assurance as to the reality or extent of Inspiration can thus be given? What one man welcomes as the truth, another repudiates. One man extols the beautiful morality of the Sermon on the Mount, and has no doubt that it is from heaven; but the same man rejects with disgust the equally explicit declarations concerning the supreme necessity of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as a condition of acceptance with God, and essential to all true morality. Some men can find no note of Inspiration in the Scripture teaching concerning the fate of the lost, while others receive the doctrine of future punishment as part of the Divine Revelation. But what doctrine is there that would not be discarded by some on the plea that it does not commend itself to their reason or conscience? The doctrine of the Trinity is repugnant to many; the Deity of Christ a stumbling-block; the Vicarious Atonement a remnant of Rabbinical prejudice, a survival of Jewish ceremonialism foisted upon the Revelation mainly by Saul of Tarsus; the doctrine of Regeneration is speculative mysticism; and so might we go through them all and we should find that, man being the judge, by one party or another, every doctrine of the Word would be declared destitute of the 'inspiring' quality. Human reason would treat the Bible doctrines as Vivien's venomous tongue treated Prince Arthur's knights, leaving 'Not even Lancelot brave, nor Galahad clean.'

The more we examine the conflicting claims of these rivals to our belief, the more are we convinced that *'the old*



*is better.*' With the Apostles and the Early Church Fathers with the Reformers and Puritans, with the faithful of all ages, we elect to stand by the Full Inspiration and Infallible Authority of the Word of God.

The Psalmist of old said of the Word as known to him, 'The sum of Thy Word is truth,' and we, warranted by the evidence we have examined, say the same of the Word as we now have it. According to some we ought to read that as if it meant '*some* of Thy Word is truth'; according to others, 'the *substance* of Thy Word is truth'; but we prefer to take it as it stands, 'the SUM,' the *sum total*, the *whole*, which includes *every part*, 'of Thy Word is TRUTH.'

We submit that, spite of all attacks made upon it, the doctrine of Plenary and Verbal Inspiration—the doctrine upon which this College is founded; the doctrine which this College has gloried in proclaiming, the doctrine fought for by our honoured Founder and President, loved and taught by the venerable Rogers, the loyal-hearted Fergusson, the beloved Gracey, still stands, and ever will stand, 'four-square to all the winds that blow.'

---

'FOR ALL FLESH IS AS GRASS, AND ALL THE GLORY OF MAN AS THE FLOWER OF GRASS. THE GRASS WITHERETH, AND THE FLOWER THEREOF FALLETH AWAY: BUT THE WORD OF THE LORD ENDURETH FOR EVER.'—1 PETER 1. 24, 25.

THE END.



18 ✓

DATE DUE

This image shows a blank, aged, cream-colored page, likely a ledger or notebook page. The page features a vertical line and horizontal ruling lines on the right side, creating a grid-like structure. The paper has a textured, slightly mottled appearance with some minor discoloration and a small dark stain on the left edge.



220-35  
11218

6118

6118 ✓

~~PROPERTY OF~~  
NORTHEASTERN UNIV. INSTITUTE LIBRARY  
NEW JERSEY



THE MASTER'S COLLEGE

220.135 M123g

MAIN

McCaig, A./The grand old book : being le



3 3540 00001 7791